




PRESENTED BY

W. R. Everett

14 m i

V.
5/26/27

G. M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY
CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
2700 GLENWAY AVE.
P. O. BOX 04320
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45204-3200



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

VOLTS FROM A LAYMAN'S DYNAMO

II

VOLTS FROM A LAY- MAN'S DYNAMO

VOLUME II

Entitled
MESSIAH *or* BASTARD:
Which?

By

HERBERT W. MAGOUN, Ph.D., (J.H.U.)

Editor of the *Āsurī-Kalpa* (Sanskrit), and *Mexican Linguistics*; author of over one hundred monographs and papers on such matters as Comparative Religion, Philology, Prosody, Old Testament Problems, and the authenticity of ancient extant documentary evidence; lecturer on other similar topics; associate editor of *The Bibliotheca Sacra*, etc.; formerly professor of Greek, then of Latin, then of both, and whilom college president.

GEORGE MARK ELLIOTT LIBRARY
The Cincinnati Bible Seminary

HAMILTON BROTHERS, *Publishers*

Hamilton Place :: BOSTON

1927

232.8
M275
V. 2

Copyright, 1927, by
HERBERT W. MAGOUN

All rights reserved

MADE IN U. S. A.

Set and electrotyped by
SMITH & VIAL, INC., BOSTON, MASS.

Presswork by
BERWICK & SMITH CO., NORWOOD, MASS.

2603

DEDICATED TO
Seekers after Truth, whether Jew or Gentile
Catholic or Protestant

"The absolute justice of the system of things is as clear to me as any scientific fact." — THOMAS HUXLEY.

PREFACE

THERE are times when a man does not realize what he is doing. That is what happened when this book had its inception. A request had come in for an article for the *Bible Champion*, and one was promised. Other work, however, interfered, and months went by.

In the meantime, the original idea had so expanded that a single article would not cover the ground, and a series was the result.

In a somewhat altered form the article first contemplated can be found in Chapter VII.; but no one would suspect that it was the nucleus of the discussion which began to appear in October, 1914, concerning the virgin birth.

A chance conversation with an acquaintance was the cause of the alteration. He casually mentioned his doubts and difficulties in that connection, and his words set in motion a train of thought as to what reasons any one could give for not doubting those things.

It gradually became evident that such doubts were common. Could they be met? And, if so, how? A grilling search for the truth followed; but that was nothing new, since a world riddle had already been faced and answered.

The author had himself known a time when it seemed as though the earth was slipping from under his feet, though certain fundamental convictions still held firm. Evidently the thing must be thought through to a

what these ancient teachers had believed. He said: "Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation."

As the atoms of Democritus were supposed to be streaming through space at a tremendous speed and to have somehow got entangled with one another, the universe being the ultimate result, Spencer's definition ceases to look modern.

But these same physicists also taught a theory of emanation, curious and crude. For generations scientists ridiculed its fundamental idea as absurd; and yet to-day that same idea has been revamped into a new emanation theory, which is receiving a wide acceptance as the latest word in scientific hypothesis.

The discovery of radium, with its strange peculiarities, has wrought the change, and atoms have given place to ions, as a result of which matter seems to be, in the last analysis, merely the product, in the various elements and their combinations, of differentiated motion, unceasing and miraculously persistent.

In religious affairs a like condition can be discovered; for dogmas come and go, and so do heresies. Toward the end of the second century A.D., the "Alogi" rejected the λόγος and the Gospel of John, ascribing the latter to Cerinthus, an agnostic; and in our day other men have left no stone unturned in their efforts to get rid of that gospel because of its teachings concerning the miraculous.

Among the strange ideas credited to Cerinthus there appears one that is known as "the malignity of matter," and this notion has a curious parallel in a prominent modern religious cult.

As he was the first to attempt to combine oriental and Christian tenets, Cerinthus may be regarded as the precursor of twentieth-century teachers of "New Thought," a philosophy which is not new except in the sense that it is the most recent and perhaps the most remarkable of the attempts to engraft Christian ideas upon speculative pagan systems of belief.

The real basis of "New Thought" is older than Buddhism, which in turn is older than Christianity; for Buddhism borrowed the motion of the "All-soul" from the *Vedānta* of Brahmanism, which teaches it in detail in the *Upaniṣads*.

Celsus, in the second century of our era, Porphyry, in the third, and Julian the Apostate, in the fourth, all taught things which are inimical to Christianity, and they were promptly recognized as such by the Church; and yet some of the same ideas are actually found in supposedly Christian authorities to-day, to say nothing of the notions of Spinoza, who flourished in the seventeenth century.

But the most persistent and common of religious questions affecting Christianity has concerned the divinity of Christ. As early as the second century, the Ebionites were denying it and rejecting the epistles of Paul and also Paul himself, since they held to the Mosaic law. They had their day and disappeared.

Then came the Arians, who denied the deity of Christ and made him a created being, though admitting a qualified divinity. The Appolinarians followed, and they maimed his human nature. The Nestorians came next, rending him asunder and making two persons of him. Finally, the Eutychians appeared. They are not so well known, but they managed to confound in his person those natures which they could distinguish and thus added their mite to the controversy.

All of these passed away as the result of four great councils of the Church, which severally rejected them one after another. Then came the Nicene Creed, and peace reigned for about eight hundred years.

After that a discussion concerning the Trinity arose, and, as a result, in 1773 the Unitarian Church was founded in England by Lindsay, although three men had been burned there at the stake, in 1611, for denying the Trinity. Since John Biddle had appeared in the meantime, as the leader of those who entertained similar doctrines, he may be regarded as the real founder of Unitarianism.

Teachings of the sort that he advocated are now becoming common; for they crop out in what are supposed to be orthodox pulpits, and little account is made of them. Men say, "What difference does it make, anyway?" And, having said it, they consider the matter settled. For some reason they seem to be unable to realize what is actually involved, and discussion concerning the matter accordingly appears to them not only superfluous but also out of place.

Invective is out of place; but invective is not discussion, even if men do often assume that it is, and it is not argument. It accomplishes nothing beyond belittling the cause that resorts to it. A genuine discussion, however, exposes the weak spots and is therefore not only pertinent but also necessary, if there is to be a correct understanding of any question.

The problem is complex and difficult, and most men are but superficial thinkers at best. If they were not, they would not so often be likened to sheep. Moreover, they would not be so prone to follow self-constituted leaders, many of whom exploit their fellows for their own personal gain.

Deep thinkers cannot be flattered or cajoled — as most men actually are in the ordinary walks of life — by those who “have an axe to grind.” They look below the surface at the thing that lies concealed beneath the flatterer’s ingratiating manner, and they soon recognize his duplicity.

A real leader forgets himself and his own interests in his anxiety for the public weal, and he does not hesitate to do a thing merely because it will not be popular. If it is right and necessary, that is enough. On that basis he goes ahead and lets consequences take care of themselves.

Just now it appears to be rather popular to question the virgin birth of Jesus. Men seem to pride themselves on belonging to the rational school. As modern slang has it, they “hail from Missouri and must be shown.” Such persons will undoubtedly be surprised to

learn that there are conservatives who claim the same place as their stamping ground. They, too, must be shown. And they must be shown with the utmost clearness. Otherwise, they will not admit for an instant that the claims of the rationalists, so called, are either tenable or rational. They can find too many fallacies in them.

From their point of view, the only really rational view is the traditional one, and they are able to give a reason for the faith that is in them. Strange as it may appear to some, they are satisfied that the bulk of the evidence, philosophical as well as historical, is on their side of the question. They believe, moreover, that the "rational view," or that which claims to be such, is merely one of the products of a materialistic age in which the subjective views of skeptical men have been given an undue prominence.

Those who doubt and then reject the virgin birth think they are well rid of a difficulty. They forget that they must presuppose, as a condition precedent, the most stupendous lie—no other word will cover it—ever fabricated. Moreover, it never seems to occur to them that they have simply exchanged one difficulty for another, and that the new one is worse than the original ever was. And yet that is exactly what they have done in reality, and the new difficulty involves others as bad as itself.

Either Christ was born of a virgin or he was not. Concerning this point there can be no dispute. If, however, he was not so born, he must have been what the Jews

have always said that he was and what they still call him — “Jesus the Bastard.” There is no alternative.

He was begotten out of wedlock. All the evidence shows that plainly. Nor was he the son of Joseph, in spite of the frantic efforts that have been made to construe the facts in such a way as to make it appear that he was.

The Jews have never so regarded him. They do not so regard him to-day. From the beginning that view has been a purely subjective one, and it has had no real backing. This, then, is the dilemma which the “rationals” are unwittingly trying to foist upon the conservatives:—What was Jesus? Was he the Christ, the Son of God? or was he a bastard, the son of an unknown father? Was he the product of lust rather than of the Holy Ghost?

Coarse as this may sound—it is plain speaking—it is the truth. The time for using gloves is past, and this thing must be faced, and faced in all its baldness.

The conservatives must be shown. They want to know what they are worshipping, and they have a right to ask.

Moreover, if the second or rationalistic horn is taken, a new dilemma arises:—Whence came the perfect character of Jesus?—where did he get his wonderful personality?—and what was and still is the source of his extraordinary power? The Jews have never attempted to deny his works. They could not do that. The best they could do was to claim that they were wrought by means of Egyptian magic.

From their standpoint, this was the rational explanation of facts that they were unable to dispute. Is it also rational to assume that this is the force that is operating to-day in the lives of Christian men?

Does it explain Jerry McAuley's transformation? Does it account for his subsequent life? Is it the force with which the Christ of the Church is slowly remodeling the entire world?

That he is doing it, no sane man can deny, even if evil men and seducers are waxing worse and worse. They must do so, if they are to persist in the face of the light which they now have, and it was plainly foretold that the closing days of our era would witness just such a phenomenon.

Here is a real difficulty — nay, several of them — beside which the original difficulty sinks into insignificance. If Jesus was the Son of God, all the rest — including both his life and his works — follows naturally. But if he was, essentially, a bastard, as must have been the case on the rationalistic basis in spite of legal technicalities, the whole thing becomes a stupendous miracle even if the story itself from start to finish is pure fiction.

Water cannot rise above its source, and no man's conceptions can rise above his experience or his observation. Whence, then, came the conception of this unique character in the history of the world? Is it rational to regard it as fiction? Could it have been invented by men of a merely human mould? Four ordinary men told the story. Did they become supermen in some fashion and thus obtain the capacity for the task?

It is now fashionable to assume that the gospel writers worked according to modern library methods with written documents; but the whole history of learning in the Orient denies this possibility, and present methods among European orthodox Jews, and even among Syrians, likewise deny it. The real textbook is the teacher himself, and the pupil's notebook is his brain. Memory writes the words that are spoken, and the recollection is consulted where western scholars refer to a printed volume, or else to notes of their own making.

Wherever this method is not in use among orientals, western ideas have gained a foothold and original habits have been supplanted as a result. The "Quelle theory" is therefore a patent anachronism.

If there were "Sources" of any sort, they took the form of oral traditions. These traditions then persisted, essentially unchanged until committed to writing, just as the basic materials of other oriental literary productions have done. No other course would have been natural, and no other supposition is rational. That makes four independent gospel writers necessary, since the documents show just the kind of differences that would arise under the conditions named. Human wisdom is thus at fault.

It often is. It omits essential factors from the equation. That is a habit which is common to brilliant men. It may blind some; but the thinking conservative must be shown. He wants something that will stand the test of a searching analysis with the acid of experience and the alkali of established fact. Assumption cannot do

that. It disintegrates in the process and discloses its impure structural formation.

Moreover, where elements are involved that exceed the limits of his own experience, the conservative must accept the honest testimony of the witnesses rather than the conjectures of subjective thinkers who do not hesitate to substitute their own opinions for established beliefs.

Radium is not a "rational" substance; but we accept the evidence of its existence, although most of us have no experience with it in actual life. What, then, shall we think of the virgin birth and the divinity of Jesus?

As the Trinity lies at the foundation of the whole problem, that must be considered at the beginning. Then the question of Joseph and Mary must be taken up — it has many curious ramifications, and some decidedly strange conclusions have been reached in connection with it — and the supposed evidence that Joseph was really the father of Jesus must be dealt with.

There is not a scrap of genuine evidence to that effect, even if some do stoutly maintain that there is — they stultify themselves in the process, even going so far as to claim that they can "prove" it by scriptural statements.

What they really do is this: They pervert certain texts and then construe them to suit their preconceived theory. These texts must therefore be examined with some detail, so that the pretenses based on them can be exposed, and, incidentally, the two genealogies must be studied.

Then the problem already referred to, concerning the source of the power of Jesus upon earth, will have to be

considered at some length, and its relation to the puzzle with regard to his birth will need to be taken up in the same connection, because each of these things bears upon the meaning of the word "divinity." The content of that expression needs to be determined. In what sense was Jesus divine?

All of this leads into deep water; but the swimming is always better there than it is in the shallows, and the rationalists seem not only to be doing their swimming in the shallows, but also to be doing it over a decidedly rocky bottom. What is meant will be made plain later.

There are yet other considerations, however; for, in addition to these things, a striking argument from analogy still remains. It ought to be weighed with care, and its bearing upon the whole situation should be duly noted.

A most extraordinary condition of affairs has recently come about in the scientific world, and it incidentally affords, in material things, an unlooked-for parallel to the matters under discussion. Its nature is such, in fact, that it may prove highly edifying to those who are rationalistically inclined. This factor is particularly commended to their earnest attention.

It so happens that scientists and non-scientists are actually vying with one another in accepting teachings which no physicist on earth would admit to be tenable, not to say rational, if they were not the result of facts scientifically ascertained and duly corroborated.

As it is, no one questions them, although they would appear to be the insane vaporings of a disordered brain,

if they were not a by-product of the most exacting scientific labors. The evidence upon which popular beliefs concerning these matters are based is also pertinent to the question in hand and should therefore be considered in its proper place. But when all this has been done, there will even then remain the remarkable prophecies of the Old Testament concerning the Messiah, which were fulfilled in minute detail in the person of Christ.

What was the meaning of these forecasts of things that were to be? Whence came they? How are they to be explained? Will mere coincidence cover the astonishing agreements? Would it suffice in any other department of literature? Where details are minutely fulfilled, as they were here, is coincidence an adequate cause or a satisfactory explanation of the facts?

But if coincidence breaks down, as a means of accounting for the phenomena, what is there left as a substitute? Late dates will not cover everything, and it is of little use to resort to them. All of these things are pertinent to the discussion and necessary parts of the material that must be considered.

This might seem to cover all the ground; but it does not, since one of the most vital elements in the entire problem is the personality of Jesus himself, a thing which has been the wonder of every generation since he first appeared upon earth. Fathom it we cannot; and yet we may apprehend it by the simple and well-known process of proceeding from the known to the unknown. That will be the method used. It may be found helpful, if not illuminating.

Then, there is his estimate of himself. That, too, must be considered; for what a person thinks of himself is always an important item in his personal equation. What Jesus thought of himself cannot be omitted, therefore, from the problem, and it will be found to lead to an inescapable dilemma.

Finally, there is the problem of the cross. What did Jesus mean when he said: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all *men* unto me"? If he was merely an ordinary man, how could he draw all men unto him by dying as a malefactor? His death was the most ignominious that could be conceived of by the people of his day, and it should have sunk him to the lowest depths of infamy. Instead of that, it did not even bury him in obscurity: it made him the most conspicuous figure of the ages. How is that to be explained? Was the cross a mere accident, or was it a part of God's eternal plan to redeem mankind?

Certain modern Jews, learned and brilliant men, and some atheists, have tried to make it out that Jesus was a myth; but the indications are that the only myth involved was the product of their own heated imaginations. Wishing to think that he was a myth, they proceeded to convince themselves that the thought was true. After that they tried to convince others.

On the other hand, some modern Jewish thinkers publicly admit that Jesus was a historical character, and one of them, Joseph Klausner, Ph.D., of Palestine, has published a book called "Jesus of Nazareth." This is now available in English. It makes no attempt to deny

the historicity of Jesus, but contents itself with a labored effort to discount his teachings and his works.

Its author is well acquainted with all that the Jews have had to say about Jesus, and the myth idea has no place in his conclusions, however partisan these may be. He claims to be impartial; but many of his Gentile readers, as suggested by his translator, will fail to see it. The book undoubtedly has a certain appeal to Jews, even to those who are orthodox; but it is a work for "rationalists" rather than for evangelical Christians, however significant it may be.

The myth theory, therefore, cannot stand, the Jews themselves being the judges. To most Gentiles it is, on its face, so absurd a subterfuge that it does not even deserve serious consideration. That point can accordingly be omitted.

When the ground has all been covered and the various details — including a technical escape from the charge of bastardy — have been duly considered, it will be in order to ask whether it is less rational to accept the teaching of a virgin birth than it is to assign divine qualities to a virtual — if not an actual — bastard, provided we take the most charitable view of the case, and to recognize in the same man a personality so commanding that it has transformed cannibalistic savages into mild and gentle creatures utterly unlike their former selves — to say nothing of "Twice Born Men" — and an authority so potent that men of every age and clime have accepted it and gladly yielded to it in all the relations of life. The facts are known and beyond dispute.

As they cannot be denied, it may be clear why the conservatives are moving to Missouri and demanding to be shown. Rationalists cannot monopolize that prerogative, although they may share it and justly ask to be shown. For that reason the attempt will now be made.

CHAPTER II.

THE TRINITY.

As already intimated, the divinity of Jesus is a difficult and complex question. For modern thinkers, the trouble seems to begin almost invariably with the doctrine of the Trinity. There are those who find it impossible to understand how there can be a Father, a Son, and a Holy Ghost, while at the same time there is only one divine being.

Mohammed had the same difficulty, and he met it by teaching that God is one, Christ being merely a prophet. In other words, he cut the knot which he could not untie. That is what modern Unitarianism does. It gets rid of the difficulty by discarding what it finds hard to understand. Moreover, it then ignores not only the complications but also the disastrous implications which inevitably result.

And yet the doctrine of the Trinity is by no means as impossible as these men have supposed, and it involves no such difficulties as they have assumed. To hold that "intellectual people are Unitarians" is both misleading and untrue. Some intellectual people are Unitarians without any question; but the great majority of them always have been and still are Trinitarians.

Great names can be found in the Unitarian ranks; but, almost without exception, it will be discovered that they belong in the class of brilliant thinkers rather

than among those who must be classed as profound thinkers. Indeed, it is quite impossible to match such intellects as those of Gladstone and Bismarck, both of whom were Trinitarians, in the Unitarian fold.

If it is urged that these two men had their limitations, nothing is gained thereby; for all men have their limitations, and great men are no exception to the rule. Moreover, as far as that is concerned, it may be said, without fear of successful contradiction, that Unitarian great men have been from the beginning rather conspicuous for their limitations.

They are apt to be persons in whom the sensibilities are overshadowed by the intellect, or the will,—that does not necessarily imply that they are intellectually superior to other people,—and, for that reason, they cannot be regarded as “well-balanced men.”

Where exceptions are discovered, it will be found that they always approach, so far as their personal views with regard to Jesus are concerned, as closely as possible to Trinitarian teachings, and there are men of that sort who actually owe their power as preachers to early Trinitarian associations and a Trinitarian training.

Then, too, it seems necessary to admit that the only known source of supply for the Unitarian Church is found in Trinitarian congregations or in students from Trinitarian churches; for Unitarianism plainly grows by means of accretions from the ranks of other churches that are Trinitarian in their beliefs, and many of its shining lights have been brought up in a Trinitarian faith and then gone over to the Unitarian fold.

It does not follow that men who have thus apostatized are to be regarded as among the choicest and best of their various denominations, because they have not been.

The truth is that they have sought to escape the restrictions imposed upon them by the orthodox churches, along with the tremendous authority assigned to Christ by orthodox believers; and, in some cases, investigation makes it only too evident that self-indulgence has had more to do with the matter than intellectual convictions, they themselves being the witnesses.

No motive of that kind can ever lead to spiritual power. Moreover, the absence of such power in the average Unitarian needs no advertisement. Indeed, Unitarians often realize more or less clearly that Trinitarians have something which they do not possess, and they are puzzled by the fact.

They wonder what it can be and occasionally even ask some Trinitarian for information along that line. As it is impossible to give any such information without starting a controversy, the one who is thus approached is forced to remain silent. He cannot, for obvious reasons, supply the desired instruction, however much he may feel inclined to do so.

Trinitarians who are aware of these things cannot repress a smile, and some of them find it hard to abstain from ridicule, when they read Unitarian tracts so written as plainly to indicate that the propagandists of that persuasion are endeavoring to catch unwary Trinitarian youths with the bait of an assumed intellectual superiority, which seems as bumptious as it is unwarranted.

The whole trouble lies in the common failure — or inability — to differentiate a trinity from a triad. A trinity is a threefold unit, a single complex entity containing three distinct elements. A triad is three different units.

The human mind is a trinity; for it consists of an intellect, sensibilities, — recent nomenclatures are no improvement upon this, — and a will. Each has its own functions to perform, and yet each is indissolubly bound up with the other two.

Each must have equal force, or development, in a normal individual, and if a person has any one of the three so constituted that it overbalances the others, that man or woman is not a normal specimen of the race. The judgment of such an individual is never reliable, for the simple reason that it is warped by his one-sided development. No other result is possible, and no other need be looked for.

A preponderance of intellect leads to coldness, lack of sympathy, and a tendency to be erratic. Sensibilities in the ascendancy produce instability and sentimentalism, and good material for a mob can always be found in that class of people. An excess of will is accompanied by unfairness and an unreasonable desire to run the universe for one's own particular benefit.

A person of that kind cannot see that another may be wiser and better fitted for certain tasks than he is, no matter how patent his limitations may be to others; for such a one has a notion that he was born to rule or, at least, to keep other people straight, and he proceeds on

that basis whenever and wherever he finds it feasible, regardless of consequences.

Distinct as these three faculties are, it is impossible to separate them, and it requires all three of them to constitute a mind. Every trinity is of this sort. It is by nature a complex unit, and it cannot be anything else. A triad, on the contrary, never makes a true unit.

Triads are common in heathen cosmogonies. A god of the earth, a god of the air, and a god of the sky — merely three varieties of lightning — can be found in India as well as in Babylonia, and the modern Hindoo triad, *Brahma-Visṇu-Śiva*, does not stand alone by any means. This may account, in part, for the propensity to regard the Christian's God as a triad, rather than as a trinity.

Men take the language of Theology with too much literalness. They see one god in the Father, another in the Son, and a third in the Holy Spirit. No such position, however, is necessary; for the limitations of language and of human experience must both be reckoned with, and the important thing is never the form of the words used but always their veritable content.

Shallow thinkers maintain that James and Paul are at odds in their teachings concerning works. They appear to be, but they are not. Paul has in mind the tithing of mint and anise and cummin, while James is thinking of the daily life and conduct of a believer.

Paul says that the just shall live by faith, not by the minute observance of an external ceremonial law, which is a matter of form and not an inward experience. James

asserts that a man who has faith must of necessity show it in his daily conduct.

With that contention, Paul is evidently in hearty agreement. So far as the form of the words employed is concerned, a contradiction may seem to be involved; but — the moment their content is considered, any such implication is necessarily excluded. Paul's works are those of the Jewish law. The works referred to by James are Christian deeds of kindness and good will. There is therefore neither contradiction nor ground for comparison in the two positions.

On this basis, "Father," "Son," and "Holy Spirit" must be considered in regard to the content of each expression as a technical term. They cannot, accordingly, be dealt with as words that are to be taken in a literal, materialistic sense. They are the simplest and best means that we have for conveying the thought that lies behind them; but their form should not be allowed to overshadow the fact that the thing meant is not necessarily what would be meant in daily conversation.

Technical terms are always peculiar in their use. They must be so of necessity. These are no exception, even if their domain is that of religion, and the importance of this fact cannot be overestimated.

The thing itself should be kept in mind, and its meaning will become clearer as the argument progresses. Certain other matters, however, may be helpful in this connection, especially if they are considered first.

To return to man himself — every human being, taken as a whole, constitutes a trinity, since no man has ever

lived who did not possess a body, a soul, and a spirit. Each of these three things must be accepted as a true entity of some sort. To omit any one of them is to produce something less than a man.

All three are found in a man, and it is impossible to create a man, as we understand that word, without involving each and every one of the three. What each one is does not necessarily matter in this connection, since the fact itself is generally recognized; and yet, in the effort to get a better idea of man's complex nature, it may be well to turn aside for a moment to consider briefly the character of each.

The world in which we live is an enormous mass of inert inorganic material. This material constitutes the so-called Mineral Kingdom. On the surface of the earth, however, organized matter appears in the flora and fauna of the different regions as we know them. These are grouped respectively as the Vegetable Kingdom and the Animal Kingdom.

The chasm between the inorganic mineral kingdom and the organic vegetable kingdom is bridged by a mysterious force which we call life. This force takes the inert matter of the earth's crust and forms it into a cellular structure, which, in turn, produces the thing commonly called a plant. In the broad sense of the word, vegetables of every sort have a "body" made up of this cellular tissue.

All living creatures also possess a body, which, in like manner, consists of a peculiar cellular structure more highly organized, for the most part, and more complex than that found in the vegetable kingdom.

Man himself, therefore, has a body so constituted, and he has it in common with the plants and the animals. It is the direct result of the action of life, first on the mineral substances of the earth's surface and then on the organic matter consumed by the creatures of the animal kingdom. Up to this point, the situation is fairly simple and clear, and the chasm mentioned is sufficiently conspicuous.

The dividing line between the vegetable kingdom and the animal one is not easy to determine. The two seem to merge in the lower forms of life. As soon, however, as a sharp distinction can be made, the higher forms having been reached, it becomes plain that animals possess certain powers of motion and have a capacity for sense-perception.

They can — most of them — experience such things as cold and heat, wetness and dryness, hunger and thirst, joy and pain, and the question at once arises — What new force has been added to life to make this result a possibility? So far as his body is concerned, man is an animal, and he accordingly shares this faculty of sense-perception with the animals. What part of him is responsible for that fact? for bridging the chasm between plants and animals?

But — there is another chasm to be bridged. It lies between man and the animals properly so called. Man thinks. He reasons. He distinguishes right from wrong. He looks at things and ponders them before making up his mind. And he apprehends and worships God. No mere animal can accomplish such results as these.

An animal is a creature of impulse. He obeys the strongest motive that chances to impel him. He does not even know that it is a motive. He feels, and then he acts. Experience is his guide, and pleasure and pain constitute the bulk of that experience.

Men will do things in spite of pain, simply because they are right. Animals have no such power. They follow and obey their limitations. What, then, can this third force be called which is a part of man, but not a part of any mere animal? What do men possess which no animal can have?

It is evident that no animal can have what we call a spiritual nature. The thing is unthinkable. The spirit, therefore, appears to be the element which enables men to overtop the animals, as they do, and God gave it to them at the beginning. Man is, accordingly, something more than "a living creature." He possesses a spirit, and no mere animal can do that. Spirit is a new force above and beyond the animals. What does that signify?

The logical conclusion, from which there seems to be no way of escape, compels us to turn to the soul as the intermediate force, by means of which man perceives and experiences the various phenomena surrounding him in this world. But he shares that force with the animals! Can an animal, therefore, have a soul?

The very idea of such a thing is likely to be received with incredulity or even with horror. "Soul" and "spirit," however, have never been differentiated with sufficient care to prevent them from being constantly confused with each other, and "soul" is freely employed

where the word spirit would probably cover the ground more accurately.

Indeed, "animal soul" is actually used in some connections as if there were two kinds of souls — animal and spiritual.

Men seldom think clearly in this domain, and much confusion accordingly prevails. They say "soul," and never stop to think what they mean. In the New Testament, we find both "soul" and "life" used, in the same connection, to render *ψυχή*. If a man is determined to "save his life," he will lose it. And, then, what is it going to profit him, if he gains the whole world only to "lose his own soul" (life, R.V.)?

In this teaching of Jesus (Mt. xvi. 25 f.), a single Greek word has been rendered in two ways, and it is evident that a single idea is intended to be expressed. The same part of man is referred to in each instance, and it is that part which enables him to enjoy the things of this world. Nothing else will fit the New Testament passage, and experience proves that Christ told the truth. Cf. Gen. i. 30, marginal reading (A.R.V.), and ii. 7 end, the same Hebrew expression being used in each verse.

Those who live for the pleasures of this present existence — are bound to have them, in short — soon tire of them, and this class furnishes most of the suicides in civilized countries. Those, on the other hand, who sacrifice their pleasures for a life of righteousness soon discover that they have not lost life's zest but enhanced it.

Things have changed. Their pleasures are no longer selfish. Life is simpler and more natural. And it is

more satisfactory. In other words, they have saved it. But the selfish pleasure-seekers have lost theirs in the very effort to save it.

"Soul," then, may be said to cover the capacity to feel and to perceive. Sense-perception is accordingly its proper function, and the animals have it to a greater or less degree. It varies with them in accordance with their position in the scale of being, and it may therefore be extremely feeble; but it is there in some measure, nevertheless, and it functions as it should.

Moreover, it bridges more or less distinctly the chasm between the animal and vegetable kingdoms, very much as life bridges that between vegetable growth and mere mineral accretion or crystallization.

Finally, spirit furnishes the force which places man at the top of the series. This, at least, with our limited knowledge and experience, is what the facts seem to indicate, though all such matters are beyond human comprehension in some phase of their phenomena.

Man, then, is hopelessly complex. But the story is only partly told even now; for his peculiarities of personality must still be considered, and these involve yet further complexities, some of which are puzzling.

Personality, as we know it, includes the whole of a man's make-up; and yet it varies in the same individual. Every man is said to be this or that according to the point of view of the one who speaks of him. The matter goes deeper, however, and deeper than has thus far been intimated. It may therefore be best to take up the remaining phases of the subject in another chapter.

CHAPTER III.

THE TRINITY AND PERSONALITY.

PERSONALITY appears to be a simple thing. That it is not, however, is shown by the diverse views entertained by different persons concerning the same individual. Each sees him from his own angle, and each has his own opinion of him in consequence. A man's reputation is made up of these conflicting views. It is a sort of composite photograph, and it is therefore never altogether reliable.

In spite of that fact, it constitutes, in a general way, a picture of a man's personality as his fellows see him. His own opinion of himself always differs from this, and it may be taken as the basis for a second personality. But his actual character, as God knows it, is unlike either of these, and that furnishes a third or true personality. Paul recognized this peculiarity in himself (1 Cor. iv. 3 f.) and it exists in the case of every man and every woman.

The important thing, however, is not the fact itself, but what lies back of it. Ex-President Fairchild of Oberlin was the personification of benevolence. This peculiarity was universally recognized and publicly admitted; and yet, on one occasion, in a faculty meeting, a rebellious and impudent student so aroused his righteous indignation that he walked up to him and spoke a few words with such astonishing sternness that even the college professors listened with awe.

It is said that some of them actually trembled. In fact, more than one of those present received a suggestion of what sort of an experience it might be for a sinner to be faced by his rejected redeemer sitting in judgment.

Here was a strange personality manifested in a wholly unexpected way by a well-known educator. It made a tremendous impression, but the man's real personality included sternness as well as benevolence, and the contradiction was only apparent.

It sometimes happens that the same man may appear at one moment as a cruel monster and at another as a most tender and affectionate parent. Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde have their counterparts in real life; for, if it had not been so, Stevenson's book would never have been written. It would have been a travesty too glaring for general acceptance.

Double lives are all too common in our great cities, and they postulate, on the part of those who live them, a sort of dual personality. Under the influence of hypnotism, dual personalities are often revealed in the subjects treated, and scientists have been much puzzled by the fact. In rare cases, a third personality has been brought to light by the successive stages of hypnotic influence, and some have actually tried to explain the matter by resorting to the pagan idea of reincarnation and previous states of existence. They suppose that these are recalled in hypnosis.

While conclusions of that sort are altogether too radical to be accepted, this much is probably true. Every man exhibits at times the personality of his mother, in

one way or another, although his father's peculiarities may be more conspicuous in his ordinary conduct. This gives him, in a sense, two personalities. But a third, his own, dominates both of these and determines not only which of them shall have the larger influence in his daily conduct but also what sort of a man he shall actually be.

Any one who will carefully study life, as he or she has experienced it, will be able to trace each of the three personalities in his own particular case.

If his father and mother were of unlike temperament, he may seem to be a bundle of contradictions; but in the end the choices which he individually makes from day to day will determine his character and his destiny.

Every man has within him an ideal toward which he is inclined at times to strive. But he likewise has evil tendencies within him, and he sometimes finds himself doing what he would not and unable to do what he would. Paul states it in one way and Plato in another. Each of them, however, recognizes actualities, and each describes them effectively.

Plato's figure of the white horse and the dark at variance with each other (Phaedr. 253 f.) means the same thing in the last analysis as Paul's plain statement of fact. Plato places the final responsibility in the hands of the charioteer; but the charioteer is only a figurative representation of the dominating personality, or the individual will, which determines the final course taken by the horses.

Man's personality, then, as well as man himself, is hopelessly complex. In him body, soul, and spirit are

combined together to form a trinity. In his mind intellect, sensibilities, and will are united to form another. In his personality, as the word is ordinarily used, his father's features and characteristics are commingled with those of his mother, while his own choices dominate both and mould them to his will. The ultimate result is a sort of threefold personality, or trinity of characteristics and qualities.

Some men seem to differentiate themselves into two persons, after a fashion, and they then talk to themselves as to a chum. Those much alone easily form the habit. Under proper conditions, men have also actually observed themselves doing something, and the act has become an impersonal one, so far as they were concerned. Someone else was doing it, as the matter appeared to them during the process.

In their sleep men sometimes do things and have no knowledge of the occurrence, either at the time or afterward — unless informed of it or made aware of it by some tangible evidence left behind them. They likewise gain the power to work out difficult problems, or actually do work them out in their sleeping hours, and the subconscious self, so called, gets the credit for the performance. What is that subconscious self?

Concerning it, the philosophy called "New Thought" has much to say, and many are wondering how far such teachings can be tenable. It is not the conscious personality of the waking hours. That much is clear. And whatever it is, it, or something else, does accomplish most of the things claimed for it.

Is it the real self? Is it the dominating personality, as it appears in the regnant will, which is a force having marvelous power at times over man's physical disabilities? During periods of great strain or stress, that will enables men to endure things which would, under ordinary conditions, prostrate them completely. How does it do this?

Whatever the answer may be, it is clear that man's complexity is beyond his powers of analysis. He is a mystery to himself. A mystery he must remain. There is no help for it. Men are human, and the divine alone can comprehend all that humanity means and is. We are told that man was made in the image of God; but the metaphor can only apply to his personality or his spiritual nature. It cannot have reference to his physical body.

That is too self-evident for argument. It cannot refer to his earthly experiences as he receives them through his sense-perceptions. That also is self-evident. On this basis, the soul — taking the word in the sense already indicated — must also be excluded. The spirit alone is left, and God is a spirit.

"Soul" is used loosely to indicate the intelligent part of man. "Spirit" is employed in a similar way; but it may mean soul in the abstract or a disembodied soul, and sometimes it appears to mean merely the religious faculty. No such usage satisfies, and it is fatal in technical language.

If spirit is the highest and most exalted part of man, — no one will deny that, — it cannot be a mere adjunct of soul or a mere state of soul. It must be, on the con-

trary, the dominating factor in personality — the thing that puts the divine element in man, and the thing that makes him a moral being.

On that basis, soul is the force which enables a living body to experience the phenomena of sense, while spirit is the force which enables an embodied soul to think abstractly and choose righteously, or otherwise; for the will is a moral as well as a spiritual faculty, a thing usually overlooked in our day.

The possession of a soul involves a varying degree of intelligence, but it is always of an inferior sort. The possession of a spirit carries with it the highest kind of intelligence, and usage recognizes the fact; for a spirit, human or otherwise, is always good or bad, according to the choices which it makes, while a soul is commonly spoken of as if it were devoid of any moral quality.

This gives us a logical sequence. Life organizes. Soul adds perception and intelligence. Spirit contributes a moral nature and makes men godlike. But it also supplies the real basis for personality, since, otherwise, animals would have a personality, and no animal ever does or can do that.

However odd this reasoning may seem, it is scriptural. It tallies exactly with the passage already considered (Mt. xvi. 25 f.), and it fits into other New Testament teachings. A word that is rendered "life" and "soul" in the same connection, where the fundamental idea is plainly one, must have reference to something attached to this world. It is therefore something permeating the body and using it as an instrument.

Spirit refers to the higher faculties, or to the mentality, and to moral qualities, and spirit is accordingly not the thing referred to. What is meant is the force that lies between the two extremes, which must be the soul.

Along these lines there is still much to be learned; for a man's spirit is the thing which really constitutes the man himself. The rest is subordinate and incidental. The spirit is vital and supreme, since will and personality are both products of the spirit.

But if the spirit of a man is complex beyond the ability of the wisest of the race to analyze and interpret, what shall be thought of the spirit of the Creator who framed man and made him like himself, a personality potentially moral? Has He no complexity? Is He restricted to one solitary personality, while almost any man is able to manifest himself distinctly in three?

Charles L. Dodgson is little known outside of the ranks of mathematicians; but as the author of "Alice's Adventures in Wonderland" he is known wherever the English language is spoken. He is no longer Charles L. Dodgson, however, but Lewis Carroll. As such, he has revealed himself to children.

He could not do so in his capacity as the author of abstruse mathematical works. The thing was impossible. He found a way — as Lewis Carroll, a much humbler personality.

But his powers were not even then exhausted; for he was still able to reveal himself as a father to children of his own. Is it hard now to see three personalities in the

same individual? Does any one ever confuse the three in Charles L. Dodgson?

God, the Father, is the Creator of the universe. Could He manifest himself as such to men? Could He show himself in all his majesty to the feeble creatures who walk this earth? Was He therefore helpless? Was He less able to exhibit a minor personality that would be comprehensible to them than Charles L. Dodgson was to manifest himself to children?

Christ, the Son, is God's manifestation of himself to his human children; but He is still the same individual deity divested of his unapproachable and incomprehensible qualities. Christ, the children of men can understand. He speaks their language.

The Holy Spirit remains, and through that personality God acts as guide and monitor to his children as a father would. He is, however, the same identical deity.

Poor and inadequate as the above metaphor is, it suggests the truth. Language is a faulty medium at best, and we have no means of accurately representing God's different manifestations of himself. We have none for representing the different personalities which a man may exhibit, except different names.

To mathematicians, the author mentioned above is Charles L. Dodgson. To children, he is known and loved as Lewis Carroll. Charles L. Dodgson is to all such unknowable and unapproachable. To children of his own, he would be "Father," and that personality is unlike either of the others. The three personalities, however, involve but one individual.

Has God less complexity or less power and versatility? Is it inconceivable, or irrational to suppose, that He could differentiate his personalities and then, as the Creator of all, send one of them, or even a representative portion of one of them, to assume a limited form in a human frame and so reveal himself to men? And could He not continue to influence the hearts of his people through the third as the Holy Spirit?

These three form the Trinity which H. G. Wells spurned. But — he then postulated “God, the Invisible King,” “the Creator,” accompanied that with a “God of the Heart,” whose relations to the Creator man may never be able to comprehend, and ended with a “finite God,” sharing with men their sufferings, their longings, and their victories. He did not arrange them in that order, and he appears to have confused things somewhat; but, in the last analysis, he merely reproduced in an inferior form the Trinity of the Bible as Christians know it.

The use of the word Son may have caused him to stumble as it has others. It is the best term we have to express the thought, and it is the most natural. A body had to be prepared and be born of a woman. That was the only way in which it was possible to accomplish the desired result. Men perceive by the senses. That means a physical presence. A physical presence means a body. And a body meant a birth of some kind, if God was to be manifest in the flesh.

Was it out of place for God to make use of the same creative power in connection with that birth as He did when He put life into the world? A new creature, a God-

man, could thus be produced, whereby God could really manifest himself to men. Was it necessary to resort to a virtual (or actual) bastard? Can you make Jesus anything better than that, provided he was merely human, even if you do assume without warrant that Joseph was his father? Do such conceptions produce saints?

We cannot deny life. It is here, and we have it. It is, moreover, in itself, a greater miracle than any possible modification of the regular method of propagating it can be. Whence came it? Who gave it? And did its author, having given it, cease then to have any power over it? If we cannot conceive how He did this particular thing, can we conceive how He has always propagated the life which He gave at the beginning?

With all our boasted intelligence, how much do we actually know, how much can we claim to know or hope to know, concerning the secrets of the process itself? Which sex furnishes the primordial cell? That is still in dispute. What determines sex? No one really knows. Why are some persons mutually barren, although each may be fruitful with another mate? No one can tell. Why does a union of different races sometimes act in that same way? It is an unsolved mystery. And why do some such combinations make for progress, while others tend to degeneracy? No one can answer with authority.

But if we know so little of these things, is it the part of modesty to assume that we know what God could or could not do, when He decided to manifest himself to men?

And if we refuse to believe what we do not understand, can we believe in any reproduction by a sexual process, or in digestion by the aid of various juices, or in the power to think, or in sight itself, for that matter? We experience these things; but no one really understands them. No one can, save in part. How, then, can we understand the deeper things of God?

A wise man, they say, is never less alone than when he is alone. Such a man has within himself that which enables him to satisfy his desire for company; for he finds it possible to commune with himself. Ordinary persons are not able to do anything of the sort.

Time never hangs heavy on a wise man's hands; for he is possessed of vision and can think ahead. But is it believable that God has less resources than a wise man has, within himself? Is it, accordingly, irrational to suppose that He communes with himself, as He is said to have done, as Father and Son?

In all matters of this kind, men are really dealing with that which is beyond them. Men are human — finite. God is divine — infinite. No man can by any possibility comprehend Him. The best he can do is to reason feebly from analogy and try to apprehend the divine qualities and character. God will never cease to be God, and we shall never cease to be men — in the sense that we are created beings.

Is it, then, an evidence of intellectual superiority to flaunt our littleness in the face of our Heavenly Father and assume that He could not do what we cannot see how He was able to do?

Is it an evidence of any such superiority to take a position which inevitably results in the assumption that He was reduced to the expedient of employing a virtual bastard, if not a real one, as the medium for his physical manifestation on earth? Was that the best that He could do, in providing a Savior for mankind?

This is the logical dilemma to which the present tendency to deny the virgin birth and call all men divine directly leads. It is a genuine slough of despond; but few of those who slip into its borders realize whither their footsteps are tending. To go on and be consistent is to sink into the quagmire of infidelity, since Christ must thus be made the most stupendous fraud in history.

It will be the purpose of the next chapter to show how clear the evidence is that he was one of the two things already mentioned — either Christ, the Son of God, in the sense given, or else Jesus, the Bastard, the son of an unknown father.

W. 11
If he was the latter, he was either an imposter and a monumental one, or else a lunatic crazed to the extent of believing himself God. There is no dodging that conclusion. But can either epithet be made to fit his character? Which is he — a colossal hoax or the most precious inheritance of the ages, the Savior of mankind?

CHAPTER IV.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF JOSEPH TO JESUS.

IT is astonishing to what lengths men will go when led by prejudice. It is amazing, moreover, to what extent they will stultify themselves in defending such positions when once taken. They seem to be blind to everything but the point which they seek to establish; and other items, no matter how essential they may be, thus escape their notice.

An excellent illustration of what is meant may be found in the Syrian version of the New Testament, which was discovered in the Convent of St. Catharine on Mt. Sanai, in 1892, by an English lady named Mrs. Lewis.

Recognizing the importance of the original writing on a certain palimpsest, shown her in the convent, she obtained permission to photograph it, and the photographs thus secured led at once to a careful investigation of the manuscript itself.

It proved to be one of the earliest translations of the Gospels, going well back, apparently, into the second century; but it soon showed other peculiarities which made evident the fact that it was the work of some follower of Cerinthus or else of some member of the Ebionite sect, since it rejected the divinity of Christ and took the ground that he was begotten by Joseph, not by the Holy Ghost.

This was accomplished by corrupting the text in some places. Thus, Matthew i. 16 had been made to read:—

“Jacob begat Joseph: *Joseph* (to whom was espoused the virgin Mary) *begat* Jesus, who is called Christ.”

Two new words had thus been inserted, while those that came between — “the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus” — had been altered to match the editor’s insertions.

Notwithstanding this fact, verse 18 still continued to read practically as it does elsewhere:—

“Now the birth of the Christ was on this wise: When his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, when they had not come together, she was found with child from the Holy Ghost.”

In verse 19, it appeared, as it usually does, that he was minded to divorce her; but verse 21 had been altered to read, “bear *thee* a son,” while 25 had been abbreviated and changed to say that she did so.

No variation of meaning was found in verse 23, which affirms the virgin birth as foretold by Isaiah (vii. 14), and the whole passage was thus reduced to a flat contradiction. It asserted, and also denied the possibility of, Joseph’s fatherhood!

Now, it is a fundamental principle of textual criticism that the difficult reading is probably the correct one. That conclusion is, in fact, inevitable, since, as a rule, such a reading cannot otherwise be accounted for. But in this Syriac text, on that basis, verses 18, 19, and 23 are, by implication, sound. On the other hand, verses 16, 21, and 25 cannot fail to be rendered doubtful by the very presence of the other three in the context.

That statement would be true, moreover, even if there were no other text with which to compare this particular translation, and the "New Syriac" is therefore ruled out as evidence concerning the birth of Jesus. That version, garbled as it plainly is, could not stand, on the mere basis of textual probability; and it cannot stand on any other basis, because all the other versions are against it. They deny categorically — verses 18 and 25 — that Joseph had any opportunity to be the father of Jesus, even as an accessory after the fact.

This is not the only passage, however, which has been utilized in the effort to make it out that Joseph was the father of Jesus. In Romans i. 3, the expression, "made (born, R.V.) of the seed of David according to the flesh," has actually been cited — the Greek is γενομένου, "becoming" — as evidence that Jesus was the son of Joseph by direct generation!

The statement which immediately follows it, "And declared to be the Son of God with power, . . . by the resurrection from the dead," has thus been completely ignored, although it is vital to a correct understanding of the whole. The meaning is plain. Humanly speaking, Christ became a descendant of David, so far as his body was concerned. As evidenced by the resurrection, he was the son of God, not of Joseph. That is the implication.

Even more might be said. Literally, the meaning is, "concerning his son, the one becoming of the seed of David with-respect-to his-flesh, the-one marked-out-as the-Son of-God in power with-respect-to his-spirit of-

THE GOSPEL OF THE
SYRIAC
A. NO. 2603

D.D. NO. 232.8

holiness in-consequence-of the-resurrection from-the-dead, Jesus Christ our Lord." The virgin birth is thus implied. The Greek reads, *περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τοῦ γενομένου ἐκ σπέρματος Δαυεὶδ κατὰ σάρκα, τοῦ ὁρισθέντος υἱοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*. Observe that *κύριος*, Lord, is used in the Septuagint for Jehovah.

Now, it happens that the real situation has never been adequately set forth, and light can be shed on the Scriptures at times by studying some character in literature. No analysis, for example, of Judas Iscariot can be really effective unless the person who makes it has first followed the fortunes of Tito Melema, the handsome pleasure-loving but weak and unprincipled Greek hero — or villian — of George Eliot's "Romola."

He typifies in admirable fashion the real character of Judas, as some have long realized. Judas was not only popular enough among the apostles to be their treasurer, but he was also so much of a "good fellow" among them that no one except Jesus even dreamed of looking upon him as a traitor. There is therefore much profit in a comparative study of the careers of the two men.

Another famous book contains a plot which helps somewhat to make the situation clear in the case of Joseph. He thought to put Mary away privately, being a just man. He was visited in his sleep, however, by an experience which caused him to change his mind. He accordingly decided to go ahead and marry her.

That meant that he was to assume the paternity of the child, because it must needs have a legal father. There

was then nothing left for him to do but to give the boy his name, which is exactly what he did in fact, as will appear presently.

The situation resembles, in a way, that pictured by Selma Lagerlöf in her remarkable novel, "*Gösta Berling*." The hero is there represented as marrying the abandoned wife of his hated rival, Henrik Dohna, a stupid and ridiculous count, who, having married her by stealth in Italy, afterward repudiated her, leaving her unborn child without a legal father. Such a father was necessary, and the rôle was gladly assumed by Gösta himself, when the time came.

The Mosaic law was very strict. Its penalties, in case of unfaithfulness, were most severe. That a woman was merely betrothed did not matter, since a betrothal with them was almost as serious a transaction as a marriage is with us, especially in these days of easy divorce and "spiritual affinities."

Mary's case was both peculiar and desperate. She could not publicly tell the truth about the affair, since that would be regarded as blasphemy. And she could not escape condemnation for a condition that it was beyond her power to help or to avoid.

The fact was there. It had to be faced. Her friends could be told and probably were told. And the story would spread, as a matter of course, and be received by the gossips with a howl of derision. Meanwhile, Joseph posed as the father of the boy by giving him his name, and that met the legal complications and therefore disposed of them.

This act inevitably led to the use of "father" in connection with the boy Jesus; for Joseph could be called nothing else under the circumstances. Such a procedure is common enough with ordinary stepfathers, and it is habitual in cases of adoption. In a way, Joseph adopted the boy, and to omit the formality of being called his father would be tantamount to holding Mary up to the contempt of all the world.

Moreover, it would belie the name he had given — Bar-Joseph — to Jesus, and there was absolutely no other course open to him or to Mary in the premises. He had to become in name, as well as in law, a father to the child born to Mary.

On that memorable occasion when they found him in the temple (Lu. ii. 48), she therefore said, "Thy father and I." There was nothing else to do. That was the only way in which she could speak of her husband to the boy, especially in public, and it therefore meant nothing whatever as to his real parentage.

In a similar way, "the carpenter's son" (Mt. xiii. 55) has no significance beyond the mere fact that he bore Joseph's name. Simple politeness demanded that he should be so spoken of, even if it was generally known that he was not the son of Joseph. Cases in real life even now show that to be true.

But men are not always polite, and we have "the carpenter, the son of Mary" (Mk. vi. 3) as evidence that the people knew the facts. Even more striking is the typical oriental insult offered him by the Jews during a controversy. Turning upon him, they said: "We be

(R.V. were) not born of fornication; we have one father, *even God.*" (Jo. viii. 41.)

This was a triple slap at him — "not born" . . . (as you were); "we have one father" (not two, as you have), "the God" (this is the exact Greek reading) *whom you claim.* Ordinarily the meaning would be "our God"; but here the innuendo characteristic of an oriental insult implies the words in italics.

There can be no question that they knew that Joseph was not his father, and current opinion concerning him is registered in the so-called "Toldoth Jeshu," which is related to the Talmud. It makes him out to be a bastard.

This strange document, "A History of Jesus," does not even attempt to deny his works. It admits them by trying to account for them — done with the help of Egyptian magic. It finds no flaw in his character. Attacks along that line not being practical, the story of his birth was the only thing available. As a result, his mother is accused of having made a dissolute Roman soldier the father of her child. That gave them scope for their venom.

If the testimony of Matthew and Luke is rejected, — each had abundant opportunity to question Mary, and Luke, who was a physician, undoubtedly did so, — that of the "Toldoth Jeshu" remains. It was actuated by an all too evident hate; but it is testimony for all that, and they must have had something to base their vile charges on, since a pure fabrication could not stand, as must be clear to all.

Is it rational to accept it at its face value and assume that out of such a union a being like the Lord Jesus could have sprung? Is such a thing thinkable without a patent miracle, the very thing which the rationalists seek to avoid? Do the laws of heredity and those of nature admit of any such possibility in the case? Has anything remotely resembling it ever happened?

In another verse (Jo. vi. 42), the English translation has: "Is not this Jesus, the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" In this, some find evidence that Joseph was the actual father of Jesus; but it contains no such implication. The meaning is not necessarily, "Jesus, the son of Joseph," since it may be, "the one *who is* a Joseph-son" (Bar-Joseph); for they may have merely identified him by his legal name, and then referred to his reputed parents in a perfectly natural way. The name Jesus (Joshua) was a common one.

None of these verses, then, can be construed as containing evidence that Joseph was the real father of Jesus. He was the legal and reputed father, but that was all. A technicality does not make an actuality. Remember that.

The most important and most astonishing of the perversions still remains. It takes the words, "being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph," and construes them, regardless of all Luke's other testimony, so as to make him say (iii. 23) that Jesus was the son of Joseph precisely as he was supposed to be!

How any one could have put such a statement into cold type, if he had ever read the introductory chapters

of Luke's gospel, passes comprehension; but that is exactly what has been done, although Luke, who was a Greek and a physician, explains (i. 26-56) the miraculous conception at some length and makes Mary herself affirm her virginity.

It should be noted, however, that the English translation itself is at fault and that the Revision is worse than the King James version, since it implies a distinct separation of words that really belong together.

Two words have been mistranslated. They were mistranslated because they were not understood in this connection. They do not, and cannot, mean, "as was supposed." They are idiomatic, and should be rendered "as their custom was." The translators could not see how he could be a son of Joseph according to custom, and they rendered the words as best they could for that reason.

The two words are ὡς ἐνομίζετο, the verb being a denominative from νόμος, which means "usage," "custom," and then, by inference, "law," or that which has become established by custom. The verb, therefore, must mean "to make use of a custom," "hold as a custom," "own as a custom," "practice," "use."

Any other sense that can be attached to it must necessarily be a direct outgrowth of some one of these meanings, as the interpretations in the lexicon plainly indicate. The word νόμος comes from νέμω, "to distribute," so that its basic meaning must be "anything assigned or apportioned," "what one has in use or possession." Out of this came the prevailing sense, "established-custom."

In the passive, the verb signifies, "to be the custom," "be customary," with an impersonal construction, ὡς νομίζεται, "as is the custom." In the perfect active, it means "to adopt as a custom." Used with an infinitive, it has the signification, "to have a custom of doing."

The verb developed secondary meanings, "to think as a customary thing," "to own," "acknowledge," "consider as," or "to think of as a customary thing," "believe in," "esteem," "hold in honor," and, finally, "to occupy as a customary thing," "frequent." But still the basic meaning is never lost sight of, and no supposition whatever is implied, even in the loose English sense.

Supposition and custom are a long way apart; but a habit of mind may, perhaps, be looked at as involving a supposition, and in this roundabout way alone can the translators be justified in using such an expression. Nevertheless, they are wrong; for a Hebrew custom was involved and referred to.

That custom was the habit of enrolling a man according to his descent. It corresponded exactly to Scandinavian and other idioms, by which a child receives as its second name the name of its father plus the suffix -son. English has over seventy-five such names, not counting variations such as Matteson, Mattison, Mattson, Matson, and possibly others with a *th*. "Who's Who in America" is a storehouse of names of this sort. They are at least suggestive.

The practice was once common. It was, in fact, probably the earliest method of naming people when two names became necessary. Some of the best known in

America had such an origin. Consider Anderson, Denison, Emerson, Edison, Hobson, Hudson, Jackson, Jefferson, Nelson, Sampson (Samson), Stevenson, and Wilson.

Even more interesting is the fact that names ending in *-s* belong in the same general class. They are really genitive cases meaning "of So-and-so." Thus, the *-s* in Adams, Hobbs, Johns or Jones, Mathews, Phillips, Richards, Roberts, Rogers, Sanders, and Simons means "son of" in reality, and John Adams means "John of Adam" (son-of-Adam). Sanders is an abbreviation of Alexander plus an *s*. It is Scotch.

This idiom corresponds exactly with the Greek idiom found in "Simon *son* of John" (John xxi. 15 ff.), which is Σίμων Ἰωάννου in the original. That fact should be kept in mind; for elsewhere (Matt. xvi. 17) we have Simon Bar-Jonah (Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ), which is the Aramaic equivalent of the Greek form.

Even now the story has not been told in full; for the prefixes Mac, Mc, and M' (Scotch and Scotch-Irish), O' (Irish), Fitz (Norman), and Ap (Welsh) — as in Price, Powell, and Bowen, for Ap-Rhys, Ap-Howell, and Ap-Owen — all mean "son of" like the others. Scandinavian *-sen* has the same meaning. Jewish (or German-Jewish) *-sohn* is a translation of the prefix Bar-, as in Lewisoohn (Bar-levi) and Mendelssohn (Barmendels).

Moses Mendelssohn, the original of Lessing's "Nathan der Weise," may have been the first to use the latter name. His grandson, Jakob Ludwig Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy, has both forms in his name. The second came from his mother, Lea Salomon Bartholdy. It does not

appear that Abraham, her husband, used it, although he may have done so.

Further material of the same sort can be had if desired. Thus, in Russian, the suffix *-vitch* (*-vich*) means son of, and it is in common use, to the practical exclusion of the surname, which is kept for formal occasions or legal documents. If a man whose given name is Adam has a son Peter, the latter becomes Peter Adamovitch. Moreover, our John Nicholson (or Nichols) parallels in form Ivan Nichalevitch, to which a surname would be added.

It must now be clear that Peter's name was really, in effect, Simon John-son, and that Christ's was Jesus Joseph-son Ἰησοῦς (Βαριωσήφ). The fact that the Hebrew or (here) Aramaic used a prefix makes no real difference. The meaning is not affected thereby, and the antipodal difference between the Orient and the Occident is preserved.

Translation has completely obscured the fundamental facts concerning Hebrew methods of naming people and no little confusion has resulted. It is time that a return was made to actual conditions, and that full recognition was vouchsafed to the fact that Jesus was enrolled as a Josephson. Luke (iii. 23) so records the matter in idiomatic Greek, as has already been intimated; for he knew what those two words meant.

The true meaning of the verse, therefore, is this: "being a Son, as their custom was, of Joseph" (a Joseph-son), etc. The rest of the chapter gives his assumed pedigree as a son (foster son) of Joseph, and, accordingly, his full legal line in that capacity. If the old Greek text is followed, instead of Westcott and Hort, "Son of Joseph"

will be united, not separated as here, and it is therefore to be preferred. It eliminates the misunderstanding.

The patronymic plainly accords with established Hebrew custom, as certain Jewish names even now make evident, and that fact is stated by Luke; for there is no "the" in the Greek. The translators put that in themselves. If he has been misunderstood by them, that is an incidental mishap. Such things are common to all men. Unfortunately, this instance is not the only infelicity of which the translators have been guilty.

Take the word βίος, for example. They have hardly done justice to it anywhere; for its actual meaning is "manner-of-living." It does not mean "life."

Now, note the effect of a recognition of this fact. The passages take on a new significance:—"pleasures of their manner of living" (Lu. viii. 14); "peaceable sort of life" (1 Tim. ii. 2); "affairs of his private life" (2 Tim. ii. 4); "time past of our way of living" (1 Pet. iv. 3); and "pride of one's way of living" (1 John ii. 16).

Similar infelicities can be found in the Old Testament also; for "wall" in Exodus xiv. 22, 29, is misleading. The real meaning is a "protection" or "means of defense." So the word "angel" might profitably be changed to "messenger" in various places.

Thus, in 2 Kings xix. 35, the thing referred to, as modern research has at last made plain, is virulent bubonic plague (*pestis major*) or something similar to the so-called Black Death.

Perhaps the most astonishing of such passages is that found in 2 Kings vi. 6b, where the meaning of the Hebrew

appears to be quite different from the English translation. In reality, it is this: —

“And he stripped a tree and caused *it* to go in thither and caused the iron to flow.”

In other words, Elisha cut and trimmed a sapling, just as a modern woodsman does in such emergencies, and then, with its help, fished out the lost implement. Men still recover ax-heads from the water in exactly the same way.

A lack of knowledge of such things led to the postulation of an unnecessary miracle, and men have stumbled over the passage ever since. The real miracle was not the floating of the ax-head, but the finding of it in the muddy waters of the Jordan. Observe that the young man was the one who took it up.

There has been a similar difficulty in the passage under discussion; but any competent Greek scholar will soon be convinced by a careful study of the original that the translation of the words in Luke as here given is correct and is, in reality, the only allowable one in the premises.

“Suppose” is never an accurate rendering of the Greek verb there employed. Supposition is not and cannot be what the verb actually refers to, since its sphere is a totally different one. There is nothing hypothetical about it, and there can be nothing hypothetical as has been abundantly shown above.

Its use by the translators, which arose from their difficulty in understanding Luke, is therefore an unfortunate one. It is not to be commended. Even more might be said; for they have rendered seven different verbs in

the New Testament by "suppose," although every one of them has a more exact equivalent in English.

Content of the words has been sacrificed for an easy or smooth translation; but the outcome has not been altogether happy. It is not well that the single English word "kill" was used in the Authorized Version for ten different Hebrew verbs and seven different Greek ones. The word "wall" is quite as bad, standing, as it does, for fourteen different Hebrew expressions, besides a participle, and two Greek nouns, though the participle can be excluded.

The wonder is that no real harm has been done. "Thou shalt not kill" (commit murder is what the Hebrew means) has led to some curious doctrines; but it has not stopped their advocates from eating meat! Neither has it stopped them from killing mosquitoes. Why not? Both things involve killing.

It will now be seen that the two genealogies must be looked at in a new light. They will be considered in the next chapter. The subject in hand has to do with the relationship of Joseph to Jesus, and it must now be clear that the so-called evidence "proving" that he was his father amounts to nothing. It may be dismissed as incompetent. The indications are that no Jew ever had any such notion, and the real evidence is against it unequivocally.

Matthew says explicitly that Joseph never had a chance to be his father, even as an accessory after the fact,—that is what the original really means, since it refers to carnal intercourse,—and Luke is equally positive. As a

physician, his word has unusual weight, and he makes Mary a virgin. Moreover, the "we passages" in Acts show that during Paul's imprisonment he had about two years in or near Jerusalem, and he himself declares that he "traced the course of all things accurately from the first." He has been found to be accurate even where modern scholars have been quite positive that he was in error. To put him on the other side is therefore absurd.

He gives Mary's version of the matter. She declares that she is a virgin (Lu. i. 34), and then comes the assurance that the child shall be begotten by the Holy Ghost and be called "the Son of God." The story was sure to become common property sooner or later, since she would certainly tell it to some of her woman friends, and three units in such cases make one hundred and eleven.

Ridicule was inevitable, and hilarity would accompany it. Some one would know that Joseph had thought of ridding himself of Mary, and that element was certain to add to the interest of the gossips. The rumors would grow, and such things never die. In this instance, the effects would be particularly potent and lasting. Traces of them can be found in the gospel narratives.

So far as Mary's implied delinquency was concerned, the thing itself was common enough among her neighbors. The man "without sin" (the same sin was the one referred to) could not be found in the crowd that brought the woman taken in adultery to Jesus. Their withdrawal one by one establishes that fact. It is a sufficient commentary, by itself, on the actual situation, so that more need not be said.

But — “misery loves company,” and so does sin. The faults of others, real or apparent, — it makes little difference which, — always receive due attention at the hands of the scandal-mongers. They would in this instance.

It is reasonably certain, therefore, that the venom of the gossips in Jerusalem caused them to roll the tale concerning Mary under their tongues with glee, and it would be safe to assume that they did so even if we did not have the slanders of the “Toldoth Jeshu” as corroborative evidence. We do have them, however, and they seem to settle the matter.

The issue, then, is perfectly clear. Was Jesus conceived of the Holy Ghost, as the Gospels declare, — undoubtedly on the best available authority, including the testimony of Mary herself, and that of Joseph so far as can now be judged, — or was he, as the Jews have always affirmed and still believe, just an extraordinary bastard of unusual intellectual acumen?

Was he, if you still persist in that impossible view, conceived in sin and later “legitimized” by a marriage of compassion, because Joseph took pity on Mary in spite of her delinquency? The child certainly was not his, and the “Toldoth Jeshu” pretends to name his father. That pretense, however, has all the appearance of being merely one of those peculiar linguistic adaptations that are occasionally found.

Imperfect knowledge of the Greek tongue might easily lead to a misunderstanding of the word παρθένου, “of a virgin,” and also to its mispronunciation. It would then naturally be taken for a proper name, and time

might easily mould it into the form found in the "Toldoth." Pandera — some write it Panthera — is really less of a perversion of Greek παρθένου than are various other well-known and well-established metamorphoses from other tongues (of earlier normal expressions) which occur in English.

Thus, the Purgatory River in Colorado is said to have been changed from its Spanish form, "Purgatorio," into French "Purgatoire," and, lastly, into "Picket Wire" by local talent. In a similar way, St. Mary la Bonne has produced, apparently, "Marlbun"; St. Mary Axe, "Simmerex"; Beauchamp, "Beecham"; Terre D'Urber-
villes, "Derbyfield"; and Route du Roi, "Rotten Row."

Such forms bear directly on the problem, even if some modern scholars do scorn the solution suggested for Pandera, and "Tommy Atkins" has been helping on the good work with such terms as "Wipers" for Ypres, "Thick Mud" for Dixmude, and "Crossboys" for Croix au Bois. Popular etymology sometimes does strange things.

"Son of Pandera," as was long ago suggested, may have originated, therefore, in the way mentioned; for it must not be forgotten that the Talmud — the "Toldoth Jeshu" seems to have been based on its statements — was transmitted from one generation to another for centuries by oral tradition, and its written form is comparatively modern. Moreover, it was not in Greek but in Hebrew (the *Mishnah*) and Aramean (the *Gemara*). Opportunity was certainly not lacking for all the perversion that can be postulated in the premises.

A motive was not lacking, as well; for "Jesus the Bastard" he has been and still is among the Jews. They were determined that he should rank as such, and a name for his father was a natural consequence of any misunderstanding of a Greek term. Such a name would help to clinch matters. That point is clear. And as nothing could be said against the character of Jesus, his birth was assailed with an excess of venom. They could not express their contempt.

He was accordingly described as the offspring of a dissolute Hebrew woman and an unscrupulous Roman soldier — a "war baby"!

The contrast between the attitude of the Gospels and that of the "Toldoth" is abysmal. Which of the two fits his character? Which corresponds the more closely with his work on earth? Which tallies with the effect produced on the children of men by his teaching? Is the "Toldoth" one rational? The Jews themselves now repudiate it!

In the light of what has now been said, is it not clear that no supposition which makes a man the father of Jesus is tenable, unless a monumental lie — that is the correct word to use — on the part of some one is provided for in the construction of the narrative? Matthew explicitly denies the possibility of any such thing as fatherhood on Joseph's part; for he excludes (i. 18-25) all carnal intercourse — that is what his words mean — both before and after the marriage, until Jesus was born, and he must therefore have been deceived by some one or else be a base deceiver himself. If he was deceived, who deceived

him? And if he was a deceiver, what was his motive? These questions must be met and answered by the rationalists.

Luke is almost as explicit, although he presents matters somewhat differently. He, too, then, must be either a deceiver or one deceived. Is it reasonable to suppose that he was a deceiver? What possible motive could he have had for such an unheard-of falsification? Could either of these men have been able to deceive the other so completely that he would promulgate a false story of a virgin birth, as he assuredly must have done in case his story is not true? What is the rational conclusion on that point?

Did either of them deceive Mark? He it is who makes the Jews say, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" (vi. 3), and the Greek has τῆς Μαρίας, "the Mary," an expression much like "that Mary" in colloquial English, although it may mean "our Mary." They plainly did not believe in any Joseph theory, nor did he. Furthermore, he also calls Jesus "the Son of God" (i. 1), and he makes Peter say (viii. 29), "Thou art the Christ," very much as Luke says (ix. 20), "The Christ of God." Mark never mentions Joseph. Would he have denied the virgin birth? Did he not recognize both the popular disbelief in it and the evidence of its truth? What conclusion is rational here?

Not being a member of the original apostolic group, Mark got his information from Peter, and we have clear ancient testimony that he made no attempt to go beyond what Peter said in his public discourses. Would Peter

be likely to touch upon the question of the virgin birth in preaching to a general audience such as he must have had? Would he not necessarily pass it over as likely to lead to needless controversy among his auditors?

It has done just that down through the ages and is doing it yet. Men positively refuse to believe in the truth of the story, although thousands of such are enrolled as church members, and it is therefore a fair conclusion that they are under obligation to those who do believe to explain how such a story, in case it is not true, could have originated.

It fails to appeal to the human intellect, precisely as deep-sea life failed to appeal to scientists. They "proved" that such life was impossible, so they said; but it kept right on existing, until physical proof dispelled their notions and showed that it could and did exist. They therefore had to resort to a discreet silence. The virgin birth persists in like manner, and it must be faced.

John is left. Was he deceived by some one? He says, at the end of his gospel, that he has not recorded all that Jesus did, but that those things which he did record (xx. 31) "are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." Does that indicate that he believed that Jesus was the son of Joseph? Could he have believed any such thing and said that?

What about Joseph? Was he deceived with the rest or was he the monumental liar who deceived them all? If he did deceive them all and, incidentally, did his work

so well that he compelled them to believe him and pass the story on as a true one, is "monumental liar" too strong an expression to do justice to the facts? Is it rational to believe any such supposition? And what, pray, was his motive? He must have had one. Observe that Jesus never mentioned or honored him as he did Mary. Why not?

Taking all these things into consideration, it appears that only one supposition is possible,—if there was a deceiver who deceived the rest and concealed a human paternity in the case of Jesus,—and that supposition makes Mary herself the guilty person. A motive can be provided in her case—to conceal her shame. No other motive can be found on the part of any one; but if she did it she was the most amazing liar that the world has produced, since she succeeded so well that none of them questioned her veracity. They not only believed her but told the story as truth!

Now, think a moment. If she was such a woman as that, if she could be guilty of adultery and then lie out of it so brazenly that she was able not only to win Joseph back but also to deceive Luke "the beloved physician" in spite of the inherent improbability of the tale, if she was able to do her work so effectively that not even he could expose the falsity of the story and Mary's consequent perfidy—on what possible basis can it be supposed that she was capable of bearing such a child as Jesus was, unless it be assumed that he was in fact a stupendous humbug and the world's greatest mountebank? That question needs an answer.

If you turn to that method of escaping, you must face his flawless character. Even his most deadly foes let that alone and confess him faultless. Is it rational to regard him as a deceiver? Could a mountebank catch such an intellect as Gladstone's and hold it to the end? Could the bastard son of such a mother, if Mary was a deceiver, become what Jesus certainly was?

Verily, when faith in the virgin birth goes out at the door, credulity towards something far harder to believe comes in at the window. If the story is not true, Mary was guilty, the Jews are right, and Jesus was a bastard.

It is hard to see how a man can swallow even the Joseph theory without stultifying himself, inasmuch as he fails to see into what a quagmire his acceptance of any such theory must necessarily lead him.

He really strains out the gnat of a virgin birth and then unwittingly swallows the camel of adultery, bastardy, and deceit, although he will promptly deny the fact and resort to another subterfuge, which will now be considered. It is the one point still left.

Those who would make Jesus an ordinary man, with Joseph as his father, usually reject, more or less completely, the account in Matthew, regardless of the fact that it is an integral part of his gospel. Even then, Luke remains, and his account tallies exactly with that of Matthew. To be consistent, it thus becomes necessary to reject his story likewise and so tear his gospel to pieces in addition to Matthew's.

That is not so easily done. His introductory chapters are too patently a part of his narrative. But, leaving

that aside, it is incumbent on any who wish to reject his testimony to explain how it could have been so completely incorporated in his gospel as introductory matter. It thus appears that if that part of his gospel is late, the whole must be, a position which has now been definitely abandoned.

Moreover, if it is conceivable that pious forgers did succeed in doing so remarkable a piece of work, it will then be in order for those who can accept such a theory to account for the lack of introductory material in the original gospel, — observe that it forms a consistent whole, — which is thus made to begin with Jesus at the age of thirty. As that method of procedure would be wholly foreign to Luke's nature and way of doing things, this consideration alone is enough to condemn any such supposition. Those two chapters must therefore stand.

Embodied in them, however, so effectively that it cannot be removed, is testimony which confirms Matthew's word in detail. Mary is made to say (i. 34) that she has never had carnal intercourse with a man — that is what the words really mean — and she then hastens away (i. 39) to Elizabeth and remains three months (i. 56) before she returns. Six months later, according to accepted beliefs, Jesus was born.

As the story stands, no other conclusion is possible; for the angel in his announcement to Mary states (i. 36) that Elizabeth is six months along, and the whole implication of Luke's statement is that Mary conceived at the time she was told that she would do so. That the conception was to be by the Holy Ghost is also stated (i. 35)

with direct positiveness. It is useless, therefore, to get rid of Matthew's report unless Luke's is also disposed of in a similar manner.

But the difficulty does not end there; for, even supposing that it is possible to eliminate these offending accounts of Christ's birth, an explanation must still be furnished for the evident, even if unconscious, duplicity of the men who inserted that material, for their success in getting it into the two gospels without any recorded opposition, and for the origin of the story itself, the very audacity of which would preclude its use by men who thought to enhance the interest and value of the gospels.

Put yourself in their place and then ask yourself whether so improbable a tale would commend itself to you as a practical way of doing such a thing. If it would, why have men so persistently refused to believe it for ages?

The omission from Mark and John proves nothing, unless it proves that the account is not a forgery; for, in case it were a forgery, it would certainly be found in both of those gospels, in some form. Forgers would not stop with two gospels, they would include all four. That is plain from the experience of all of us. A fraud always overdoes things.

Moreover, the accounts would be more nearly alike in Matthew and Luke than they now are; for, while they both lead to the same general conclusion, they are widely different in both form and scope.

But, again, if either account is classed as an interpolation, — that is the polite name for a literary forgery of the sort under discussion, — the other must be simi-

larly dealt with to make the supposition a success; and it then devolves upon those who are credulous enough to accept such an explanation to account for the wide divergence in the two genealogies, which would certainly have been made to agree more carefully than they now do if either were an interpolation, since no one perpetrating a thing of that kind would venture to leave such a discrepancy to discredit his work.

The rejection of either account, or of both, involves too many difficulties to be taken seriously by a man who really thinks, because such a procedure runs counter to every probability, offends the dictates of common sense in so doing, and then demands an amount of credulity exceeding in extent the faith needed to accept the story as it stands.

The true inwardness of the situation is this. Men reject the virgin birth because it seems to them to be preposterous. Having done that, they then go to any extreme, without stopping to think things through, in order to bolster up their position and justify their conclusions.

It is very much like telling a lie and then trying to cover it up with other prevarications. The result is always deplorable, because the perpetrator becomes more and more involved, until he is finally overwhelmed by the very structure that he has reared.

As a matter of fact, no part of the entire gospel narrative can be rejected, and that is one reason why Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament, admirable as it is, has forfeited its claim to being the last word in the textual criticism of the Greek original. The reaction which has

set in towards the older editions is fully justified and entirely proper, since they rest on a better and more reliable method of dealing with documentary evidence.

Omissions in manuscripts are far easier to account for than insertions, which legitimately include only glosses and explanatory notes on the borders of the documents. Glosses are words added to clarify the meaning. The English Bible abounds in them; for every word printed in italics is a gloss — unless there are exceptions where the translators blundered over an idiom.

Insertions in a manuscript are literary forgeries. As such, they have always been condemned. For that reason, if for no other, it is wrong to assume that those ancient manuscripts which have the least to say are the ultimate authority. Scribes omitted too many things in copying to make that a sound method of procedure, and there is evidence that some things were omitted purposely.

Nothing hindered carelessness of that sort, even if it was intentional, while everything hindered additions by insertion. If such had been made, the foes of Christianity would have been sure to find it out, and we should have some record of the fact to-day in contemporary literature, just as we have a record of their forgeries.

Men ridiculed the story of the nativity, and they ridiculed the story of the cross; but they never accused the early church of interpolating material in their manuscripts, so far as now appears. Fake gospels and fake epistles were promptly exposed and rejected.

If it is assumed that growth in the idea of Christ's divinity led to insertions along that line, the lack of evi-

dence of the fact must be accounted for. If the thing had happened, there would be some record of it somewhere; for the deadly hostility of the pagan world would never have allowed such a chance of condemning Christianity to slip from its grasp.

It is useless to assume that additions could have been concealed from outsiders. The pursuit was too hot to make that possible, and any remissness of the sort involved would have been exposed with fiendish delight, even if those who did it were themselves guilty of similar practices. That is only a curious human paradox that can be found almost anywhere.

No increase in Christian claims was possible, and the indications are that some of them, in the early centuries, were purposely weakened by the omission or change of a word or two, as in the New Syriac above. In John (xiv. 24 R.V.), "the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's who sent me," now appears to have read "is not man's" in the most ancient manuscripts; for it so reads in a Latin translation which must have antedated the preparation of the Greek manuscripts now extant, and the alteration is a natural one.

A change of "mine" to "man's" would at once challenge belief. That would run counter to all established canons, since the harder of two readings is usually the correct one, when they have equal authority. The change to an easier reading is natural. The change to a harder is unnatural.

Methods of escape like those here outlined are both fallacious and impossible, as will tend to become self-

evident when once the difficulties involved are apprehended, and to trust to them is to lean on a broken reed. To promulgate them is to lead a forlorn hope. The wish is father to the thought, and that is no basis for faith.

Try as men will, they cannot rid themselves of the virgin birth. If it were possible to do so, the entire gospel narrative would be undermined, all claims to a special divinity on Christ's part would be destroyed, there would be no true basis of faith in his mission or in himself, and he would be reduced to the most amazing imposter that the world ever has, or ever could, conceive of in any connection. Was he that in reality?

Just by way of confirmation regarding what has now been said, let these facts be noted. The Roman Baptismal Creed, which has been placed as early as 100 A.D., contains the words, "was born of the Holy Spirit and Mary the Virgin." Where did they come from?

Aristides of Athens, writing about 126 A.D., states that "The Christians reckon the beginning of their religion from Jesus Christ, who is named the son of God Most High," and then adds, "and it is said that God came down from heaven, and from a Hebrew virgin took and clad himself with flesh," etc. Where did he get the idea?

Ignatius, one of the church fathers, has this to say as early as 110 A.D.: "The virginity of Mary and her child bearing and in like manner the death of the Lord are three mysteries of loud proclamation which were wrought in the silence of God." How did he come to say that?

In short, everything known of the dogmatics of the early part of the second century indicates that the virgin birth was an integral part of the established church tradition. How did it come to be so, if it was not true?

Again, if Mark has no reference to the virgin birth, neither has he any to Joseph, whom he does not even mention. But — he makes Jesus the son of Mary, as already indicated, and the Son of God. Those two facts are sufficient to determine his position. He did not believe in any Joseph theory. As he did believe that Jesus was the Christ, he must have believed in the virgin birth; for the only possible alternative was bastardy. Did he believe in that?

These particular items were long ago exploited by Rev. H. M. Ramsey in *The Bibliotheca Sacra* (LXXIII. 343-368), as was one other, in part. That remains to be considered.

In our English Bibles, John i. 12-13 now reads: "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, *even* to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

The second of these verses has long been a *crux* for commentators; but there is an older reading than this one, which goes back only to about 331 A.D., the date of our earliest codex, and that older reading is significant.

Tertullian, writing about 209 A. D., testifies to a dispute about the passage, some maintaining that it was written "who were born" as designating those who believe, whereas it is really, he says, in the singular,

referring not to them but to Jesus, "He was born of God."

Irenaeus, writing as early as 180 A.D., takes the same position, as does Justin Martyr, who wrote still earlier (about 135 A.D.), and his reading accordingly antedates ours by about two hundred years.

Moreover, some of the best New Testament textual critics, including Blass and even Harnack, — he rejected the virgin birth, — have concluded that the singular must be the correct reading. But, if it is, John testified directly to the virgin birth.

Observe how natural it is for the reader to have his mind fixed on those who believe and, so, to assume that they are referred to throughout, the second birth furnishing the basis. That will explain the dispute and the present reading. See also how the Greek text lends itself to alteration.

It reads οἱ οὐκ ἐξ αἱμάτων οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος σαρκὸς οὐδὲ ἐκ θελήματος ἀνδρὸς ἀλλ' ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθησαν. Dropping σαν at the end and changing οἱ to ὁς gives the earlier reading, and a faulty final Sigma is not so materially different from a final Iota that it could not be mistaken for one by those who so understood the verse. The omission of σαν could then be explained as an accident. The change was therefore natural, even if εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ does precede the relative, so that it should refer to "him" — the name of him, who, etc.

The singular removes all difficulty from the passage. Christ was born, not "of bloods" (sexual union) — why does the Greek use the plural here with ἐξ (ἐκ) meaning

“from,” unless two human beings are referred to? — “nor of the will of the flesh” (there was no carnal desire present), “nor of the will of man” (Mary had no choice in the matter), “but of God.” It covers the ground perfectly in every detail, and it fits the situation perfectly in every detail. What, then, can be said against it? It has antiquity back of it, and it seems like the harder reading. But, if it stands, we have the witness of three gospels, not two. What is the rational conclusion here? Does it weaken the case?

But even now the evidence is not all in; for the witness of Paul, brought in above, needs further consideration. He repeatedly uses words that presuppose the virgin birth. They are meaningless without it. Possibly that is the reason why rationalists would be rid of him.

Thus, he begins his epistle to the Romans with a statement that clearly indicates his position, although it loses much of its force in English. He is the “servant of Jesus Christ,” he says, and has been “called *to be* an apostle, separated unto the gospel of God, which he promised afore through his prophets in the holy scriptures.” (A.R.V., i. 1-2.)

He then explains that this gospel was, “concerning his Son, who was born of the seed of David according to the flesh, who was declared *to be* the Son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead; even Jesus Christ our Lord.” (*Ibid.* 3-4.)

This fails to bring out certain things that appear in the Greek. The text was given at the beginning of the

chapter along with a literal translation. It can be improved with the help of glosses, thus, "concerning his Son, the-one born from the-seed of-David with-respect-to his-flesh, the-one definitely-located-as the-Son of-God in power with-respect-to his-spirit of-holiness, *as appears* from his-resurrection from-the-dead, *even* Jesus Christ, the-one *who is* our Lord."

The physical body of Jesus is thus distinguished from his inner self. His flesh was of the seed of David. The verb rendered "born" has for its radical meaning, "to come into a new state of being." He did just that. He was born of a woman. But his inner self was of God, and it was sinless.

The genitive is weakened by translation. It means more than we mean by a spirit "of holiness." It means that holiness was the substance, the chief characteristic, of the spirit that inhabited that earthly frame, and it was therefore more than a human spirit. The resurrection revealed its true nature.

"Out of the resurrection from the dead" Jesus stood forth "marked out by boundaries as *the* Son of God." That excludes the possibility of a human father, unless it is pure nonsense. In plain English it means that the resurrection proved him to be the Son of God. He was accordingly no mere man and no mere dwelling place for God. He was God incarnate. He could not be the Son of God and have a human father. The very idea is absurd. Mark's first verse is thus made significant. He calls him the Son of God, and the text holds, even if it is questioned.

Furthermore, we have lost the significance of "our Lord." In the Old Testament, Lord stands for Jehovah, in Hebrew; and the Greek word, *κύριος*, does the same thing in the Septuagint. Among the Jews of that day it meant Jehovah. Applied to Jesus, it may recognize him as Jehovah incarnate.

When Paul says, then, that "God sent forth his Son, born of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4), he must mean born of a virgin; for that was the only way in which Christ could be "God's own Son," as Paul himself calls him. "What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God *did*, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh" (Rom. viii. 3). No mere man can be meant by that. It must be God incarnate, and a virgin birth is the only rational way for God to be incarnate — manifest in the flesh — and the only possible one.

Furthermore, Paul says that "Christ Jesus" is "the image of the invisible God," in whom all things were created, "and he is before all things, and in him all things consist." (Col. i. 15-17 R.V.) Paul never could have written such words as these without believing in the virgin birth. He was too clear-headed. And he had opportunities enough to learn all the facts.

This must suffice; but even so it should be clear that the doctrine of the virgin birth is so indissolubly incorporated in the text of the New Testament, either by direct statement or by implication, that it cannot be removed without destroying the document. Figuratively speaking, it is the very foundation of the edifice, and its removal means ruin for the superstructure. Without it,

the New Testament becomes a monumental fraud. Those who fail to see that are blind indeed, and they are anything but rational. Moreover, interpolation does not account for its origin. Does it seem like the invention of an interpolator? That explanation dodges and befogs the issue: it does not answer the question as to the source of the story.

CHAPTER V.

THE TWO GENEALOGIES.

THERE are persons who take delight in discovering "discrepancies" in the Bible. It never seems to occur to them that the absence of what they regard as discrepancies would be proof positive that the book was a fraud.

Perfect agreement in details on the witness stand is recognized by all lawyers as one of the most reliable tests when collusion is suspected, and a similar agreement in Bible stories that appear at different places would be enough to condemn it offhand.

Honest witnesses never see things exactly alike, and no such witnesses ever agree in all their statements. At times they may even appear to contradict one another; but a seeming contradiction is not necessarily a real one.

Three of the Gospel writers tell of a certain anointing of Jesus, with such close agreement in some of the details as to leave no doubt concerning the identity of the occasion. Matthew (xxvi. 7) and Mark (xiv. 3) fail to identify the woman who did the anointing; but John (xii. 3) says that it was Mary. They all agree that she used genuine nard (Gr. *νάρδου πιστικῆς*) and that it was very precious. John says that there was a pound of it — the others, a cruse.

John also says that she anointed his feet, while the others agree that it was his head. John adds that she

wiped his feet with her hair. As the anointing of the head was a normal act and a pound of ointment was a quantity much in excess of what she could possibly use for such a purpose, it is not hard to imagine that she took some of the nard and put it on Jesus's feet, to John's great surprise, and that this particular part of the performance was the thing that he remembered best and therefore recorded.

Again, Judas hanged himself according to Matthew (xxvii. 5); but Luke's account (Acts i. 18) has him obtain a field with the money, fall headlong, burst asunder in the midst, and have his bowels gush out. Luke does not say that he bought the field, but that he "acquired" (ἐκτήσατο) it, and Matthew (xxvii. 9 f.) relates that the thirty pieces of silver were used to purchase the potter's field.

As the money belonged to Judas, it would be in keeping with the facts, as they looked at things, to say that he acquired the field. He did, in a sense. If, in addition, he attempted, by some chance, to hang himself above that same field, but used a rotten rope, it at once becomes clear that a violent fall from a tree — probably down a precipice, as the topography still indicates — onto broken crockery below would supply the needed elements to make Luke's account comprehensible.

An admirable illustration of this sort of thing was published some years ago in *The Bibliotheca Sacra* (Vol. LXIV. p. 767). A class in history, reporting on the condemnation of Louis XVI., could not be made to agree. About half of them declared that the vote against him

was unanimous. Most of the others asserted vigorously that there was but one majority. A few said that the majority was one hundred and forty-five in a vote of seven hundred and twenty-one.

The facts were these. On the first question ("Is the king guilty?") there was no vote in the negative. Each deputy was then asked to state his penalty. The votes that included death, at some time, gave a majority of one hundred and forty-five, while those involving immediate death amounted to only three hundred and sixty-one, as against three hundred and sixty for some other penalty or for delay in execution. There was therefore no real contradiction in the various reports submitted, provided all the facts were known.

A similar statement may often hold good in cases of apparent contradiction, and it may hold good in connection with the two genealogies of Jesus, although they have caused much discussion and many a heart-quake. If we only had the later records to consult, so as to find out what Matthew and Luke really did, the whole thing might become simple and clear. That they worked independently is beyond question, and each evidently got what he was after.

Both, doubtless, consulted public records then available in Jerusalem, unless Matthew already knew the line by heart as is quite likely. Luke, as a physician and a Gentile, would naturally seek for the particular facts that most interested him. Matthew, as a Jew and a traditionalist, would certainly follow Jewish methods and be influenced by Jewish customs, so that he would

inevitably reckon the successors to the throne of David as his countrymen reckoned them. Results would thus be influenced by differences in point of view, and that element is a vital one in studying the problem.

Some discrepancies are merely differences in dealing with proper names. No importance attaches to them, in consequence. The change from Hebrew to Greek in passing from the Old to the New Testament was bound to affect spellings more or less seriously, and that consideration will dispose of that matter.

English John and Russian Ivan do not look much alike, but they are the same name nevertheless. In like manner, Ahasuerus, in the Book of Esther, appears to be the same name as the Greek Xerxes, while Amraphel of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis may be the same as Hammurabi, the first king of Babylonia to rule over the whole country. Some question this last identification; but they would have to abandon certain theories to admit it, and that fact may be significant.

Naturally the lack of agreement in the two gospels has been made much of by the enemies of the Christian religion, and the process began very early in the history of the Church. Its defenders were then hard pressed for a satisfactory explanation. Some asserted that the lists were purely imaginary; but this was stoutly denied early in the third century by Julius Africanus, a Christian historian, who was the author of a treatise on chronology.

There was also a tradition, derived from the Desposyni, who claimed to have the royal blood of David in their veins (Gr. δεσπόουνος means "belonging to the master"),

to the effect that two uterine brothers, whose mother had first married into the house of Solomon and then into the house of Nathan, had come under the law of Levirate marriage, and, one dying without issue, the other who was the younger had raised up seed unto him. That was the law (Deut. xxv. 5 f.). The coming together of the lines in Zerubbabel and Salathiel, or Shealtiel, was still apparently unaccounted for, and the difficulty in part persisted.

The difference in the number of names in the two lists is really of little moment, since Christ himself, as the Greek plainly indicates, is called in the same breath (Mt. i. 1) a Son-of-Abraham and a Son-of-David without any regard to the intermediate generations.

The habit was a common one, and in such connections the word "son" was so used that it must either be taken in the sense of "descendant," rather than as a term applied to a man's direct offspring, or else as part of a proper name.

Other orientals have a similar custom, and it need not occasion the slightest difficulty. The trouble lies in our matter-of-fact English, which is not, and cannot be, a true medium for the exact interpretation of an oriental language. Such tongues always have their own peculiar — often nebulous — way of looking at things, and English cannot reproduce their effect.

One solution that has been offered must be left for the present. It assumes that Matthew's list contains the genealogy of Joseph, while Luke's is that of Mary. Both, as they stand, appear to be, avowedly, the genealogy of

Joseph. If either is not to be taken at its face value, it is plainly Matthew's, since he had to follow the royal line. Moreover, there are sound reasons for believing that his and not Luke's is the genealogy of Mary.

The first thing to be observed, in studying the two, is the fact that Luke goes back to Adam *Son-of-God*. That is the real meaning of the Greek, even if it does read, "the of God." The whole situation will be made plain later. Meanwhile, "of," or "the of," or "son of," or "the son of," are all used as equivalents for the Hebrew prefix Ben- (Aramaic Bar-), and that really decides the matter. Its significance will appear as the argument proceeds.

Luke, then, has an initial list not found in Matthew. It includes the names (R.V.):—

Adam — Seth — Enos — Cainan — Mahalaleel — Jared — Enoch — Methuselah — Lamech — Noah — Shem — Arphaxad — Cainan — Shelah — Eber — Peleg — Reu — Serug — Nahor — Terah (the father of Abraham).

Each of these would have for his surname, in case he needed one, the name of his father plus the prefix Ben-, which is an exact equivalent for the English suffix -son. Seth's full name would thus be Seth Adamson. That was the most natural and obvious way of naming people, and it came to be the Hebrew custom. Luke recognizes the fact and plainly chronicles it by saying (iii. 23): "being a Son, as the custom was, of Joseph, the *one who was a Son of Heli*," etc. [

As the ancient Greek patronymics had lost their force, or become poetic, that was Luke's way of saying that

Jesus was a Josephson (Bar-Joseph), Helison (Bar-Heli), etc. The Scandinavian plan was the one employed, and the English translation is merely a copy of the Greek with its limitations. The Jews were therefore fully justified in calling Jesus a Son-of-David. That is what he was — a Davidson. The Samaritans still follow the practice in naming their children. See *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct., 1903, p. 610, or Jan., 1921, pp. 1, 7, 9, 13-16. They also keep the Passover.

If the above list is now compared with 1 Chron. i. 1-4, 24-26, it will be seen that Cainan has been inserted between Arphaxad and Shelah, but that otherwise, apart from differences in spelling, the two lists are the same. There may actually have been a Cainan at that point, even if it does seem probable, on the surface of things, that there was not. When a man begets a son, he begets, potentially, all that part of his posterity which happens to fall in that son's direct line.

From an oriental standpoint, that simple fact justifies the statement that a man begot his grandson or his great-grandson or his great-great-grandson at the time when he begot the son who was the ancestor of the one mentioned. Unimportant persons may therefore be omitted at any point in the reckoning. Cf. Mt. i. 8, where Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah are omitted, as appears from 1 Chron. iii. 11-12. Azariah and Uzziah are one and the same man.

This peculiar way of looking at things should not be forgotten in dealing with Biblical and other oriental genealogies; for there is always the possibility that omis-

sions have been made. They must therefore be allowed for.

That is the serious defect in the Biblical chronology devised by Archbishop Usher in 1650-1654. That chronology is still to be found in the margin of the more elaborate editions of the Bible; but recent investigations along the line mentioned have shown it to be potentially worthless. We can never be entirely sure that all the generations are represented, and it is therefore unsafe to rely wholly, as Usher did, on the ages mentioned in the text. Such data will not furnish an absolutely reliable basis for a complete Biblical chronological scheme, since one, two, three, or even more generations may be omitted at some point in the reckoning. The important names are always given. Others did not count.

The next person in the genealogical list is Abraham, and with him Matthew begins his enumeration. With a single exception, the two now agree as far as David, Luke's names being (R.V.):—

Abraham — Isaac — Jacob — Judah — Perez — Hezron — Arni — Amminadab — Nahshon — Salmon — Boaz — Obed — Jesse — David.

For Arni, Matthew has Ram, the Greek being Aram. The two may thus be intended for the same name. With this list should be compared 1 Chron. i. 27 f., 34; ii. 1-15; and Ruth iv. 18-22. It will be found that the Old Testament has Ram, and that the Revised Version has slightly altered the spelling of the names in some places.

Up to this point there is no real difficulty. The variations found are no more than should be expected. From

here on, with a few exceptions, the two lists are entirely different, and it is this fact that has caused all the trouble. The favorite explanation holds that Matthew has given Joseph's official line and Luke his actual one.

It follows the assertions of Grotius (1583-1645), who taught that Matthew gave the genealogy of Joseph as the legal successor to the throne of David. Luke was accordingly supposed to have followed, as a physician naturally would, the private line, which exhibited Joseph's real birth as David's descendant and Solomon's heir.

Apart from one or two other minor difficulties, which will come up incidentally as the argument progresses, it is maintained that this simple principle explains all the anomalies of the two genealogies, including both their differences and their agreements; and yet the layman is still left with an uncomfortable feeling as to details, and he has a powerful inclination, even if it is somewhat nebulous at times, to ask the question: How?

As a preliminary to a better understanding of the situation, it may be best to consider what the Old Testament records teach. According to 1 Chron. iii. 10-16, the kingly line would be (R.V.):—

Solomon — Rehoboam — Abijah — Asa — Jehoshaphat — Joram — Ahaziah — Joash — Amaziah — Azariah — Jotham — Ahaz — Hezekiah — Manasseh — Amon — Josiah — Jehoiakim (omitting the two who reigned but three months each, his elder brother, Johanan or Jehoahaz, and his son Jeconiah or Jehoiachin) — Zedekiah.

The oldest son of Josiah is there given as Johanan; but according to 2 Chronicles xxxvi. 1-4 and 2 Kings xxiii. 30-34, he must have been Jehoahaz, or Joahaz, made king

by the people and then deposed, after three months, in favor of his brother, by the king of Egypt. His successor's name is given as, originally, Eliakim; but it was changed to Jehoiakim, as it appears above.

His son Jehoiachin, a boy of eight (2 Chron. xxxvi. 9) or eighteen (2 Ki. xxiv. 8), reigned three months and ten days according to one account (xxxvi. 9), and his brother Zedekiah then succeeded him (xxxvi. 10). According to 2 Kings xxiv. 8-17, however, at the end of three months, in the eighth year of the king of Babylon, the uncle of Jehoiachin was made king, his name being changed from Mattaniah to Zedekiah.

As this account is the older of the two and the ages of the men favor the arrangement mentioned, it is undoubtedly the correct statement of what took place.

Moreover, according to Jeremiah xxxvii. 1, Zedekiah was the son of Josiah and reigned instead of Coniah, — the son of Jehoiakim, — who came to be regarded as the rightful heir. This name (Coniah) is plainly a variation of Jeconiah, who is commonly known as Jehoiachin.

Matthew's corresponding list (R.V.) contains the following names: —

Solomon — Rehoboam — Abijah — Asa — Jehoshaphat — Joram — Uzziah — Jotham — Ahaz — Hezekiah — Manasseh — Amon — Josiah — Jeconiah and his brethren (apparently Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, and Zedekiah, even if they were the uncle, father, and uncle, not the brothers of Jeconiah, since the Greek word that is employed — ἀδελφούς — is sometimes used to mean "near kinsmen," although it properly refers to men who are own brothers).

As Uzziah, the tenth king of Judah, is to be identified with Azariah, three names have been omitted after Joram,

following the fashion already mentioned, and, possibly, one (or two) likewise before Jeconiah, although "Jeconiah and his brethren" may fairly be said to cover the ground, as was indicated above.

In selecting the name Jeconiah, Matthew has followed 1 Chronicles iii. 16, rather than the usage in the fuller accounts found elsewhere. The employment of different names for the same man in this curious fashion may account for some of the differences later on in the Gospel narratives, although it is not wise to infer overmuch from that fact.

Now, this man Jeconiah, or Jehoiachin, seems to have been badly treated by Nebuchadnezzar; but he appears to have had seven sons, according to the present interpretation of the record, during his lifetime as a captive. The oldest was, ostensibly, Shealtiel (1 Chron. iii. 17); for the Revised Version reads, "Jeconiah, the captive"; instead of "Jeconiah; Assir," as the Authorized Version has it. Assir would naturally be taken as the name of another son; but a different explanation of the name is possible. See below.

No sons of Shealtiel are mentioned, and none are given for the second son; but the third son, Pedaiah, had for his first born Zerubbabel (verse 19), who thus became heir to the kingly rights of the tribe of Judah.

These two men, Shealtiel and Zerubbabel, both appear in each of the Gospel writers as members of the genealogical line, and they throw some light on the problem as a whole, since the former is spoken of by Matthew as having begotten the latter, who was really his nephew,

being the son of a younger brother. Levirate marriage may be involved, though it is not mentioned.

It appears, then, that the oldest son, or the son who was made the official head of the family, was permitted to claim — if he had none himself — certain sons of his brothers as his own, a situation that is typically oriental, however strange it may appear to a western mind.

Zerubbabel's patronymic, or surname, would normally have been Pedaiah-son; but he came to be ranked as a Shealtiel-son (Son-of-Shealtiel) in his capacity as heir to the latter's rights; for the last king, Zedekiah, was a younger son, temporarily exalted and not recognized as properly in the royal line.

For this reason, Jehoiachin was so recognized, although his father was also a younger son, and the line was continued through him. The rest of Matthew's account, including the two men already mentioned, contains the following names (R.V.): —

Shealtiel — Zerubbabel — Abiud — Eliakim — Azor — Sadoc — Achim — Eliud — Eleazar — Matthan — Jacob — Joseph.

This list presents difficulties of its own, apart from its failure to agree with that in Luke's Gospel; for, after Zerubbabel Son-of-Shealtiel (Ezra v. 2, Neh. xii. 1, Hag. i. 1), it cannot be duplicated in the Old Testament records, there is no known extant copy of the Jerusalem records upon which Matthew undoubtedly based it, if he had to consult a record, and the list is too short to cover approximately six centuries, as it must, to span the interval between Jeconiah and Christ. Unimportant names must therefore have been omitted.

Up to Zerubbabel, Matthew unquestionably followed the accepted royal line; but from there on the Old Testament records are fragmentary, and we are left in the dark. Matthew, however, undoubtedly knew or consulted the official records for the rest of the line and obtained his names therefrom. But — and here is an important consideration — the true line might be a matter of dispute and of an honest difference of opinion.

The first thing to be noted about Luke's list is the fact that he worked backward from Christ, not forward from Abraham, as Matthew plainly did. The two lines thus obtained may therefore both be correct, even if they do not agree after David's name has been reached in the descending line. Luke does not take Solomon as the next of kin, but Nathan, the second (third, the first died) son of Bathsheba or Bathshua (2 Sam. xii. 15, 24; 1 Chron. iii. 5), and his list accordingly becomes (R.V.):—

Nathan — Mattatha — Menna — Melea — Eliakim — Jonam — Joseph — Judas — Symeon — Levi — Matthat — Jorim — Eliezer — Jesus — Er — Elmadam — Cosam — Addi — Melchi — Neri — Shealtiel — Zerubbabel — Rhesa — Joanan — Joda — Josech — Semein — Mattathias — Maath — Naggai — Esli — Nahum — Amos — Mattathias — Joseph — Jannai — Melchi — Levi — Matthat — Heli — Joseph.

It will be seen at once that this list contains a larger number of names than the two already given, which correspond to it in Matthew's account. As a Gentile and a physician, Luke would be likely to mention all or nearly all the names in the line that he found, as far as David. From there on he would follow the traditional list, including its omissions.

Incidentally, in examining the names, the user of the Authorized Version may be somewhat incommoded by the spelling; but it seems best to give up the old usage, even if it did follow the Greek pretty carefully. The hair-spaced names mark the two sections of Luke's list, that correspond to the divisions given Matthew's, and they also indicate the evident agreements of the two evangelists.

While none of the other forms clearly agree, some of them may do so, as is commonly taught. The name Jeconiah is a favorite one (Esth. ii. 6; Jer. xxiv. 1, xxvii. 20, xxviii. 4; etc.); and yet it was varied to Jehoiachin, which became an official form. It amounted to altering "Jah will be steadfast" to "Jeh will uphold."

In like manner, Uzziah ("Jah is my strength"), a form in common use (2 Ki. xv. 32; 2 Chron. xxvi. 1, 3; Hos. i. 1), became, apparently, Azariah ("Jah has helped"), which was also in common use (2 Ki. xiv. 21, xv. 1, 6, 7, 8, 17, 23, 27; 1 Chron. iii. 12).

Similarly, Bathsheba ("Daughter of an oath") passed into Bathshua ("Daughter of opulence"), as indicated above, and such changes were evidently common. Cf. Ruth i. 20.

On that basis, Luke's Jorim — its position in the line favors the supposition even if the relative proportions are not quite what would be expected — may be Matthew's Joram; Matthew's Matthan may be and probably is Luke's Matthat; and Matthew's Abiud may possibly be Luke's Joda, while Luke's Joanan may be the Hananiah of 1 Chronicles iii. 19, the son of Zerubbabel, with the two

elements of the name ("Jah has been gracious") in reverse order.

Rhesa and Joanan would thus be extra names in Luke's list; but some scholars see in Rhesa a Chaldee title of Zerubbabel, somewhat like the "Assir" (meaning "the captive"?) of 1 Chronicles iii. 17, and they may, perhaps, be right, although others stoutly deny any such possibility. A name or two may therefore have been omitted.

Again, Shemaiah (1 Chron. iii. 22) seems to be merely a variation of the Shimei of verse 19, since both mean some such thing as "Jah is fame" or "Jah hath heard," and the change is in keeping with those already mentioned.

Bearing this in mind, it may be allowable, as some scholars have believed, to identify the Abiud ("Father of honor") of Matthew's account with the Hodaviah ("Honorer of Jah") of 1 Chronicles iii. 24, since the change in that name would be a characteristic one. The omissions before Hodaviah would also be characteristic, and it thus appears probable that these identifications should be made.

Just here a curious fact must be noted. In 1 Chronicles iii. 21, Hananiah (Joanan?) is credited with two sons, Pelatiah and Jeshaiah; but no further notice is taken of them. He is likewise credited, however, with "the sons of Rephaiah, the sons of Arnan, the sons of Obadiah, the sons of Shecaniah." Who these men were we have no means of knowing; but the natural inference is that they were his sons-in-law and probably also, at least in part, his nephews, since that sort of thing has always been common among the Jews.

Shecaniah appears to have been his heir; for his line is the one next taken up, and it yields Shemaiah, Neariah, Elioenai, and Hodaviah (Abiud?), who seem to have been in the royal line. Matthew must therefore have followed the accepted royal line, precisely as Grotius taught and as scholars have come to believe, while Luke selected the actual individual ancestors of Joseph, as he found them recorded in the official lists. He was a doctor and a Greek.

Matthew's task, following the line downward, was a comparatively simple one, because those in the royal line would be well known to all Jerusalem, and the surviving members could be identified easily. Luke's, on the contrary, was another matter. He had to trace the line backward and meet complexities of the sort already mentioned.

If the royal line failed anywhere for any reason, the next of kin stepped in and figured as the begotten son of the last survivor, so that his real descent was obscured. Luke passed it over in the case of Zerubbabel; but Zerubbabel appears so often as "*the* son of Shealtiel" that he was justified in so taking him. In fact, he may have been so recorded.

The chances are that the real line and the royal one were so closely related all the way through that they came together more often than can now be determined because of the Jewish habit of changing or shifting names. Luke's choice of Heli was doubtless correct, Heli being the father of Joseph and Jacob the father of Mary. Matthat or Matthan was their father; but the royal line then varied from the actual one as Luke found it.

The same thing was true in the case of Shealtiel and also Joram. Just what the causes were it is not now possible to say with certainty, although their general character is fairly clear. Luke found a direct line that ended in David, and that sufficed. We can safely accept his result. He makes Neri, not Jeconiah, the father of Shealtiel, and he had a reason for doing so. Just what it was we do not know, but we may safely conjecture.

We know that Zerubbabel was born a Pedaiah-son and became a Shealtiel-son, and we know that he was reckoned as a begotten son of Shealtiel. We also know that Joram was credited by Matthew with begetting his great-great-grandson, — he omits Ahaziah, Joash, and Amaziah, — and likewise that Matthew credited Josiah with begetting Jeconiah as well as Jeconiah's father and his two uncles, and these are sufficient data to suggest a solution of the difficulty.

Shealtiel may have been the grandson of Jeconiah (Assir may be the name of his legal father as indicated below) rather than his son; for Jeconiah himself was under a curse and was to be written "childless," since no man of his seed was to prosper, sitting on his throne and ruling in Judah. (Jer. xxii. 30.) And, furthermore, Shealtiel may have been the son of Jeconiah's daughter, even if he was credited to Jeconiah by a curious Jewish custom, or to Jechoniah (R.V.).

On that basis, Luke should be right — he probably is — in making Neri the actual father of Shealtiel; but Shealtiel would still be accepted as of the royal stock, since Neri was probably a relative as well as a Son-of-David. Neri,

however, would not count in the royal line under the circumstances, and Matthew very properly omitted him. As this solution fits the case and likewise meets another consideration, it seems to be both probable and sound.

The other consideration is this. Jehoiakim was also cursed and was to "have none to sit upon the throne of David" (Jer. xxxvi. 30). For a brief three months his son Jehoiachin (Jechoniah) did sit there; but he was then carried away captive to Babylon, and his failure to have any male issue of royal rank would at once make the curse operative, since the line would pass to another, Neri's father, as Luke appears to indicate. Women did not count.

Now, Neri's line was the line of Nathan, and most of the problem may thus be solved. It is only necessary to suppose that he had an older half-brother whose father was of the house of Solomon, that this half-brother married the daughter of Jechoniah and died without issue, and that Neri then came under the law of Levirate marriage, as the tradition mentioned above requires. To a Greek the issue would be of the house of Nathan, but to a Jew it would be of the house of Solomon. To Luke, Shealtiel would thus be a son of Neri, but to Matthew he would be a son of Jechoniah, even if Assir was his nephew and son-in-law and the half-brother for whom seed had to be raised up according to the law. Cf. 1 Chron. iii. 17.

This should suffice to make it clear that Matthew's line involves various complications due to the necessity of keeping up the royal succession wherever direct issue failed. The importance of that fact can hardly be over-

estimated. Bearing it in mind, let us consider another point.

There is still current in Jerusalem, according to a learned woman long a resident of that city, a tradition to the effect that Mary was allowed to enter the temple to speak to Jesus on that memorable occasion when he was twelve years old, but that Joseph was not permitted to do so, not being of royal rank. Mary was of that rank, and she must therefore have been, as stated above, a daughter of Jacob, while Joseph was a son of the younger brother Heli.

If objection is raised to that conclusion on the ground that tradition is no longer looked upon with favor, let it be said that any such condition of mind is an unfortunate one, inasmuch as it argues that its possessor has little or no knowledge of things oriental.

If he did have, he would entertain a wholesome respect for oriental powers of that sort and for oriental conservatism. Transmission by tradition in such lands is almost as reliable as that by printed books is in our own; for orientals are exceedingly careful about alterations of any sort, while we are not. Moreover, this particular tradition fits into the facts. It should therefore hold.

The next objection seems to be but is not fatal. Matthew says (i. 16), "Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ," a most remarkable statement for a Jew to make, since it exalts Mary at the expense of her husband, although women did not count. That helps to explain things, even if it does seem strange.

Joseph was "begotten" in the same sense that Zerubabel was, and he was accordingly put forward as Mary's representative, because she could not figure directly in the matter, according to Jewish usage, being a woman. The legal fiction resembled the English one, according to which the king never dies. Joseph could therefore be, actually, the son of Heli without any real difficulty.

It is a generally accepted fact that Joseph and Mary were cousins. Their fathers, then, were brothers; for Luke's Matthat is probably Matthew's Matthan, and Joseph was therefore related to Jacob exactly as Zerubabel was to Shealtiel. It is now clear why Matthew said "the husband of Mary." The line was hers; but, as stated, no woman counted in their reckoning, and Joseph accordingly had to be put forward in Mary's place.

Moreover, if Jacob died without male issue or made Joseph his heir or so elected, as he would naturally feel like doing in consequence of Joseph's consideration for Mary, — false modesty is and always has been unknown in that country, so that he probably knew all the facts, — Joseph would become a Jacob-son and would therefore be reckoned as a *begotten* son of Jacob, in accordance with the legal fiction or peculiar idiom already mentioned.

Mary, on the other hand, would, for a time at least, count as a daughter of Heli, the father of Joseph; for she would naturally take her husband's name after her marriage, and he was a Heli-son.

She would inevitably be so spoken of, and there is evidence that she was so spoken of in point of fact. It signifies, in all probability, nothing more than that she

was the wife of Joseph; for, as such, she would be regarded as the daughter of Heli and would be so called, until such time as both she and Joseph were entitled to her father's name, being then reckoned as Jacob-sons.

The identification of Matthat and Matthan is really very simple. The public records were governmental affairs, and they were therefore kept in the Greek tongue. It was the language through which Rome managed her vast eastern domain. If any one doubts this, let him explain what made Josephus, when he wrote his history, select Greek as the medium and take great pains to perfect himself in it.

That he did so he himself asserts (*Antiq.* XX. xi. 2); but it cannot be inferred that he had in mind merely the people of Hellas (cf. Mk. vii. 26), since his remarkable friendship with Romans of high estate involves the supposition that he was really writing for any one and every one who understood the *κοινή*, the language which Alexander the Great had forced upon the Levant.

All educated persons knew Greek, the common people understood it, it was the business tongue, the New Testament was written in it, and the Romans were too astute not to take advantage of such a convenient instrumentality. That they did, we have evidence in the New Testament itself.

If, now, Luke, in examining such records, came across the name Matthan and found the final Nû written with a somewhat pronounced initial stroke, and a similar final one, the latter having a wrong curve which brought it too near to the downward stroke, he would be likely to

read it as a Tau and act accordingly. That, at least, seemed to me to be probable, since it would account for the difference and do so easily.

Proof of it was soon forthcoming. While studying the question, and incidentally turning aside to make a note along another line for my Bible class, I found just such a Νû, which I must have made myself at least ten years before this question came up. If it had been at the end of Matthan, I should have been uncertain about its identity and might have read it as a Tau. That cleared things up, as I was not aware that I had ever made such a letter. Cf. Ματθαί and Μαθάν.

It may now be safe to affirm that Matthew purposely followed Mary's line, while Luke deliberately sought out Joseph's. This will explain the curious fact that Celsus, in the second century, derided the notion that "through so lowly a woman as the carpenter's wife, Jesus should trace His lineage up to the first man" (Origen, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 32), an idea which Origen seems to have taken seriously. The assumption was based, apparently, on a difference in the two genealogical lines. It has been wrongly inferred that both men regarded Matthew's as Joseph's and Luke's as Mary's, the exact opposite being the real probability.

In support of this wrong inference, an ingenious and most remarkable argument has been developed, which uses as a basis the omission of an article in Luke's list. Back of that lies an unaccountable blunder, which assumes that the articles in Luke's list are to be taken with the proper names.

That blunder may have involved the italics of the King James Version. If so, the source of it has been eliminated from both Revisions. As the blunder runs counter to Greek usage and Luke was a Gentile, — he acted accordingly, — that should suffice. To make the matter perfectly clear, however, certain fundamental facts will now be furnished.

Where the article is used with a proper name in Greek, it always retains some of its original demonstrative force. It is therefore significant and has some such meaning as — *the*, the well-known (our), the one and only, the afore-said. Such forms are found in the New Testament.

Thus we have: — “Jesus, son of our Joseph, the-one from Nazareth,” Ἰησοῦν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέτ (Jo. i. 45); “thou art king of our Israel,” σὺ βασιλεὺς εἶ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (Jo. i. 49); “that Judas *Son* of Simon Iscariot,” τὸν Ἰούδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτου (Jo. vi. 71); and “that-man Saul *Son* of Cis,” τὸν Σαοὺλ υἱὸν Κεῖς (Acts xiii. 21). It may sometimes involve a question of fact, as in: — “Of our David,” τοῦ Δαυεὶδ (Mt. xxii. 42), and “the son of that (or our) Mary,” ὁ υἱὸς τῆς Μαρίας (Mk. vi. 3).

It will be noticed that the Greek has “the son of,” “son of,” and simply “of” in the above examples, the basic meaning being almost exactly the same to all appearance. The first, if it does not refer to a fact, is formal as a rule, the second is ordinary, and the third is familiar, ranging from kindness to contempt. Certain things, however, must be allowed for.

Thus, expressions like οἱ υἱοὶ Ζεβαδαίου (Mk. x. 35), υἱοὺς Ζεβαδαίου (Mt. xxvi. 37, Lu. v. 10), and τῷ υἱῷ

Δαυείδ (Mt. xxi. 9, 15) serve the same purpose as our modern surnames and are therefore equivalent to part of a proper name in each instance.

They are the Greek equivalents for each of the given names plus the prefix Bar- (Aramaic, in Hebrew Ben-), which amounts to the same thing as the suffix -son in the Aryan tongues.

The Greek idiom really corresponds to the Hebrew, although it does not appear to do so. The ancient Greek patronymics had already lost their force colloquially. (Cf. Ben-haded [1 Ki. xv. 18], Ben-ammi [Gen. xix. 38], and [R.V.] Ben-abinadab, Ben-deker, Ben-geber, Ben-hur [1 Ki. iv. 8-13], etc., all of which recognize the idiom.)

Certain combinations are used appellatively, as, for instance, υἱὸς Ὑψίστου (Lu. i. 32), and υἱὸς εἰρήνης (Lu. x. 6). "The Son of Man" is similar; but ἀνθρώπου requires and receives the "generic article."

Where the article is employed in the expression "Son of God," it is not generic; for the meaning is "*the* God," "the one and only God," "*our* God," God being essentially a proper name in such connections. The article is demonstrative rather than reverential.

This should be enough to clear the ground for a consideration of Luke's usage. What he really does is simple enough. He expresses "son" in the first instance and then, by a well-known Greek idiom, omits it all the rest of the way, contenting himself with "the of" instead of "the son of" or "son of," and so simplifies matters by using the colloquial form of expression. For that conclusion there is plenty of evidence.

Thus, in ii. 49, he makes Jesus say, "in the of the Father of me," ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου, instead of "in the house of my Father," while in Mark we find (ii. 14), Λευεῖν τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου, "Levi son of our Alphaeus," son being expressed by "the," precisely as "our" is. Moreover, Matthew duplicates this curious usage in x. 2 and 3.

Luke very properly omits the article, therefore, in his first expression; for there he is giving the full name of Jesus in its ordinary form, and the insertion of an article would and does destroy his meaning. He does the same thing elsewhere (iv. 22, West. and Hort), and he also has υἱὸς Ἀβραάμ (xix. 9) and Δαυεὶδ υἱόν (xx. 41).

Now, note another thing. Σίμων Ἰωάννου (Jo. xxi. 16) is an exact equivalent for Σίμων Βαριωνᾶ (Mt. xvi. 17), and υἱὲ Δαυεὶδ (Mt. ix. 27, etc.) exactly parallels Βαριωνᾶ.

If anything more is needed, we have, in Acts iv. 36, the explanation that Barnabas means "Son of Exhortation," or of Consolation — while Mark gives us (x. 46) ὁ υἱὸς Τιμαίου Βαρτίμαιος, the first being put in as an explanation of the second in accordance with his habit of interpreting Hebrew (Aramaic) idioms.

It should now be clear that Jesus had for his surname Josephson (Βαριωσήφ), and it should also be clear that he did so in conformity to a well-established Jewish custom. That accordingly settles Luke's ὡς ἐνομίζετο. He used it in its correct idiomatic sense. (Cf. Barsabas, Bartholomew, Barabbas, etc., and see Mt. xxvii. 16; Mk. xv. 7; Acts i. 23, iv. 36, xiii. 6, xv. 22.)

His ascending list, as Godet has well said, is undoubtedly a private instrument drawn up from the public documents.

Those documents, however, were compiled as fast as children were born, and the idea that the list consulted began with Heli is therefore fallacious, not to say absurd. Luke's compilation, moreover, was performed after the death of all concerned, except Mary, in all probability, and both Joseph and Jesus must therefore have been recorded in the documents in connection with Heli. To assume anything else is to run counter to both probability and common sense. This means, in plain English, that the notion that two records were here united is wholly untenable.

In spite of that fact, the feeling on which the notion was based is sound; for Luke does differentiate Jesus from the others in the list by the use of "son" (without an article) in his case and "the" in theirs. His reason for doing so is simple and plain. The rest were sons in fact: Jesus was a son in name only, and no "the" could be used.

Each individual in the whole genealogical line is thus made to appear with perfect distinctness, although the whole has been condensed to the last degree. It is a masterpiece of brevity, lucidity, and completeness, even if there is a break at Zerubbabel in connection with Pedaiah. Luke probably copied things as he found them, and it is useless to go further than that.

Taking the phraseology exactly as Luke has it, we can see on the instant that the name of Jesus was Jesus Josephson, that the name of his foster father was Joseph Helison, that the name of his grandfather was Heli Matthatson or Matthanson, and so on to the end

of the chapter, in accordance with a system which still survives in Samaria.

The full name of Jesus is given in its normal form; but after that only the given names are listed, each, except Joseph's, which was provided for in naming Jesus, having before it the expression "the of" — merely "the" (plus a genitive) in the Greek — to indicate the other needed information. The whole is a remarkable bit of work, when its full significance is once understood. It is a complete genealogical record without a superfluous word. Jesus was a "Son of Joseph, the *Son* (or *one who was a Son*) of Heli," etc.

From what has now been said it will appear that the prevalent idea that Luke gives the actual private line of descent — remembering that Matthat is to be identified with Matthan — is undoubtedly correct, Matthew's line being the official one, and therefore the line of Mary, as the Jews looked at things. That was plainly his intention; but we need to remember that it is only the oldest son of a king that is in the royal line. None of the younger sons are in that line, unless the heir dies.

Among European nations a daughter, in the absence of sons, can become the ruler; but no such possibility existed for the Israelites. Such a daughter might marry her cousin, as Mary did, and he could then count as a "begotten son" of the ruler if the latter so elected. In that way, he could pass into the line, and Zerubbabel may have followed that course. In a similar way, Joseph could be classed as a "begotten son" of Jacob to represent Mary.

We care little for the Davidic descent; but it was a vital matter for the Jews, and Matthew wrote for them. The Messiah must be a David-son, and he must also come down the royal line. Luke's Nathan, the younger brother of Solomon, — among the sons of Bathsheba, who was apparently a Hittite, — would not do. The line must come through Solomon, and Matthew's legal line does exactly that.

These considerations effectively dispose of the conflicting records of the two evangelists. Luke's is the true one from Matthat to David, as western minds see things; but Matthew's is the true one from start to finish, as Jewish minds regard them. Both must accordingly be accepted as sound and necessary, if there is to be a complete picture of the situation. Neither can be dispensed with; for each has its own part to play in the history of the descent, and the fact should be recognized. We can then understand the matter.

A single point remains: — Why did Matthew add other names of women regardless of Jewish usage? Their names will furnish the answer. The first is Tamar, who was a little irregular (Gen. xxxviii. 12-30) even for those times. The second is Rahab, whose identity is now in dispute. Matthew spells the name as Josephus does (*Ant.* V. i. 2, 7), however, and Josephus has reference to the woman saved at Jericho (Josh. vi. 25). That should dispose of Hebrews xi. 31 and James ii. 25, which have a different spelling, omitting the Greek *Chî*. The rest of Matthew's list favors the old identification, and it is only a matter of transliteration at best. Cf. Βηθλε (h) ἐμ and also

ἡμι(h)όλιον, and consider likewise Cleopas spelled Cleophas (A.V., Jo. xix. 25).

This woman, then, was a Canaanite of questionable occupation. She appears in the line, nevertheless, as does Tamar. The third is Ruth, a remarkable and lovely Moabitess; but even she could be called in question (Ruth iii. 6-18), though she was probably guiltless. The fourth and last is Bathsheba of Hittite connection, who had a similar weakness in her record (2 Sam. xi. 2-5).

If any one, therefore, was disposed to doubt Mary's right to be the mother of an heir of David, here were four other women in the line, accepted as such, who must first be reckoned with. They were there, and they could not be eliminated. They all counted, as far as women were allowed to count, and that fact could not be dodged. Moreover, Joseph was the husband of Mary and her sponsor.

The combination furnished a "knockdown argument"; but it was sound, and no Jew could get around the implications attendant thereon. It followed that Jesus was a David-son in the royal line, and therefore the promised Messiah. Incidentally, the hint was conveyed that the Gentiles had a part in the ancestral line, although the habit of not reckoning women would obscure the fact.

Here, then, is Matthew's reason. The Jews knew Mary's story and regarded Jesus as a bastard. Matthew denied that allegation categorically; but he did so after furnishing evidence that there were others in the line, who, though not so fortunate as Mary, were nevertheless allowed an undisputed place. That riddle may therefore

be regarded as solved along with the others. It was a clever bit of work on Matthew's part and an effective one.

COMPARATIVE TABLE

<i>O. T. Royal Line</i>	<i>Matthew's Genealogy</i>	<i>Luke's Genealogy</i>
Solomon	Solomon	Nathan Mattatha
Rehoboam	Rehoboam	Menna Melea
Abijah	Abijah	Eliakim Jonam
Asa	Asa	Joseph Judas
Jehoshaphat	Jehoshaphat	Symeon Levi Matthat
Joram	Joram	Jorim
Ahaziah		Eliezer
Joash		
Amaziah		
Azariah	Uzziah	Jesus
Jotham	Jotham	
Ahaz	Ahaz	Er
Hezekiah	Hezekiah	
Manassah	Manassah	Elmadam
Amon	Amon	
Josiah	Josiah	Cosam
(Johanan or Jehoahaz)	(Jehoahaz)	
Jehoiakim	(Jehoiakim)	Addi
(Jehoiachin) } Jechoniah } or Coniah	Jechoniah	
Zedekiah	(Zedekiah)	Melchi
(Assir)		Neri
Shealtiel	Shealtiel	Shealtiel
Zerubbabel	Zerubbabel	Zerubbabel Rhesa
Hananiah		Joanan
Hodaviah	Abiud	Joda

*O. T. Royal Line**Matthew's Genealogy**Luke's Genealogy*

(Omitting

Shecaniah

Shemaiah

Neariah and

Elioenai)

Eliakim

Azor

Sadoc

Achim

Eliud

Eleazer

Matthan

Jacob

Joseph

Josech

Semein

Mattathias

Maath

Naggai

Eslí

Nahum

Amos

Mattathias

Joseph

Jannai

Melchi

Levi

Matthat

Heli

Joseph

CHAPTER VI.

THE SOURCE OF CHRIST'S POWER.

MEN like to think of themselves as divine. A notion of that sort is found in ancient Egypt; for among the rites of Osiris, assigned to the dead for their observance in the other world, appears the proclamation, "I am Osiris." A similar idea is present in certain Greek mysteries, which are attributed to Pythagoras. The same notion looms large in the worship of ancestors among the Chinese, it is conspicuous in the worship of the *Pitāras*, or *Manēs*, in India, and, it crops out in New Thought and other modern systems of belief.

By this doctrine men exalt themselves, and by it modern men belittle Christ. "Oh, yes; he is divine," they say, "but so are we." And, having said it, they think the matter ended. They regard that statement as final.

But if any such conclusion follows, what shall be done with the unquestionable differences that appear between him and ordinary men, not only in his character, his teachings, and his works, but also in his position among his fellows, his effect upon the people of his own day, his influence upon all succeeding generations, and his authority over the hearts of his disciples both then and now? What man, if sane or not self-deluded, ever has dared or ever will dare to compare his own character to that of Christ? What other human character can be compared to it? And what teachings can be likened to his?

Those that come the nearest are found in the books attributed to Confucius; but they are not the same. The latter's teachings are negative and in every instance based on policy. Christ's teachings are positive and always based on ethical principles. The two approach each other; but they never meet — precisely as thrift and avarice do or caution and cowardice or self-love and selfishness or self-respect and vanity or faith and credulity. The differences are quite as marked as the resemblances are, and the two can never be compared to each other any more than the things just mentioned can be.

Passing over his works for the present, who else could ever say to his fellow men: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest"? And if any man should ever dare to utter such an invitation, does any one believe that he could make good? But has Jesus ever failed to make good when taken at his word? What does the testimony of his followers indicate?

Have all such persons — they include some of the greatest of earth's sons and daughters — been the victims of a self-delusion as colossal as it is unaccountable? Could self-delusion do the work? He does it, and he does it with men and women who are "down and out." The instances are too numerous to deny the fact, although such people are regarded as hopeless by most persons.

Who else ever transformed men, as he transforms them? Who else was ever able to make a man out of a gutter drunkard — without the use of drugs or substitutes of any sort? Where else can men find the strength to resist

temptation and refuse to do any of the things that besmirch and defile the human race? Men of every age and clime have confessedly found themselves unable to meet the test with their own strength; but Christians do it every day with his help and they do it even after they have been despaired of as confirmed and hopeless sinners.

What does it mean that he has this keeping power? That he does have countless witnesses testify. Look at the "saved" men and women in the Salvation Army. Their transformed lives furnish evidence every day of the truth here mentioned. Moreover, they can be seen and read of all men. Christ bids them sin no more, and they obey him. Where else can such devotion — nay, such absolute obedience — be found?

Is this the result of mere self-delusion on their part? Is it the product of hypnotism? Is it the fruit of a great hallucination? Why does it last through life as it does? Why are those blest who possess it? Why does it enable their spirits to triumph over the flesh, as they could not before they did possess it?

These are some of the modern works of Jesus. Is it unreasonable to consider them as evidences of the soundness of his claims? None of them are hidden from sight — they are not done in a corner. And they stand the most rigid tests. Compare a Christian community with a non-Christian one and then deny the truth if you can.

Jesus is a maker and mender of men, and he is the only real maker and mender of men that the world has ever known. Transformed characters, spiritual resurrections, selfishness exchanged for devotion to one's God — these

are modern miracles, and they can be found in any land where Christ is revered. Only the wilfully blind can fail to see them.

But what of his other miracles? Men are plainly doing their utmost to discredit them; for it is not possible to reëxamine the eyewitnesses, and an age of doubt has come, bringing with it a disposition to cavil. The Jews of Christ's day did not attempt to dispute his works, because they could not do so. They were too well known.

They admitted them and tried to account for them — "Egyptian magic!" They thought that would settle the matter. Men are still trying to account for them — "on rational grounds" — by explaining them away; and yet they still persist.

Some of the puzzling things may be solved in part; but enough remain to baffle the most brazen of skeptics, — if they are honest, — so that many such have succumbed and accepted Jesus as their Savior. Ulterior motives may prevent an outcome of that kind.

Now, if Jesus was a bastard, as the Talmud indicates, his life is past comprehension. His works are also past comprehension. And so likewise is his influence. His present power in the world, moreover, is the greatest miracle of all. Its divine character cannot be called in question by any unprejudiced mind simply because it is unaccountable on any other basis. It is unlike all other earthly influences and it transcends all others. It is revolutionary.

Nay, it is more. It destroys the naturally dominant selfishness of the human heart and makes that abode of

wickedness the abode of benevolence, — if it is given any genuine chance at the life, — and it runs counter to all that man's acumen has been able to furnish to the worldly wise.

It exalts humility, while men have despised that virtue and exalted conceit. It demands consideration for one's foes, and men have taught the opposite of that. "The thing to do is to get in the first blow." It requires us to love our neighbors as we do ourselves, while men declare that self-interest is the highest ethical principle and that it should be our dominating motive. What does it all mean?

Something may be gained, perhaps, by changing the line of approach for a time and considering the matter from another standpoint. Let us suppose, for the sake of the argument, that God has taken us into his confidence and wishes for an opinion as to the most advantageous method that can be found for revealing himself to men.

What would you say? Can you think of any better way than that of coming to earth as a man and teaching men by precept and example? And if you cannot, how should He go about it? Would you recommend that He make use of a bastard?

Would you not consider yourself crazy if you did so? Would He not require the best possible vehicle for his incarnation? Would you recommend some ordinary man? Could such a man fill the bill? Was Mr. Moody able to do it? He was as fully consecrated as a man could be; but he was no Jesus. How could he be, with his human heredity behind him?

You must not forget that God had already exhausted the possibilities in that line; for all the prophets, as well as the patriarchs and Moses the lawgiver, not to mention the high priests and the judges, had been his representatives for ages, and God had used them to the utmost in the effort to reveal himself to men through them. That fact is usually forgotten; but it is vital to an understanding of the situation. They all came short of what was needed, and every other mortal would have done the same.

What, then, is there left? How can you blend the human and the divine in an earthly frame? Can the thing be done except by utilizing divine creative power to produce a virgin birth so as to furnish a human frame devoid of the usual limitations of heredity and the innate tendencies to evil that have been gathering strength with the passing generations? Would that fail to do it? Could anything else succeed in such an enterprise?

You think, perhaps, that it could — that God could so dominate a human personality as to make it serve the purpose. Would a person so dominated be a free agent? Could he, by any possibility, be a free agent? And if it is not possible to proceed along these lines and still preserve the freedom of the individual will, what kind of a Savior will you get?

Could he be tempted and yet remain sinless? Could he be human in any true sense? Could he be divine in any true sense? Could he be anything but an automaton dominated by the divine will? How much success would attend that sort of an effort? Can you visualize any success along that line?

The person who is to represent God must first of all be a free agent. If he is not a free agent, he cannot represent God, since God must of necessity be a free agent. Such a person cannot be wholly human and still accomplish the result desired, because he cannot be God present in the flesh; for divine possession is not divinity present in the flesh any more than demoniacal possession is a demon present in the flesh. What, then, is there left?

Absolutely nothing but a new creature, in whom God's personality — using the word in a limited technical sense — dominates a human frame as an inborn integral part of that creature. Turn which way you will, you are shut up to this one conclusion. There is just one way in which the thing can or could be done, and that way involves the supposedly impossible method of a union of some part of God's personality, or some portion of his spirit, with a human frame born of a woman, which means conception with the help of the Holy Spirit.

Such a solution of the problem is psychologically sound, and it is philosophically sound also. To say that it could not be done is to deny the existence of the very power that created men and made them what they are. There had to be a first man, and there was a power that brought him into being. That same power produced the birth of Jesus in the way indicated.

In the nature of things, every effect must have a cause, and that explains the reported admission of a champion of materialistic evolution, who is said to have remarked: "Back of it all somewhere there is an inscrutable intelligence." He was right, whoever he was. Huxley it may

have been, — it sounds like him, — even if a careful search through his published works and also through the “Life and Letters” has failed to reveal any trace of it. Certainly, it was more than an ordinary physicist who made that admission to his opponents.

What, then, is that intelligence? It dominates the world and all that is therein. That is shown in countless ways in nature. What can it be except the force that rules the universe? that created the world and keeps it in its place? and that cares for you and for me?

Do you dare set a limit to its mysterious powers? Plainly, it must have been the original source of life, since no other solution has been or can be found. Has it lost its efficacy now? If it was able at the beginning to make an ovum that was capable of fructification when brought into contact with semen, was it thereby estopped from producing an ovum capable of fructification in some other way? What do we really know about such matters? Dare we assert that it was so estopped? Could it have been in fact?

But what was that force? If its existence is once admitted, as it must be in the end, have we not postulated God? And dare we say that He would not or could not take such a course, when He was shut up to it by the very nature of things and the requirements of the case? Was it biologically impossible, with multiplication taking place in the lower forms of life without generation? Do we know enough to warrant us in so declaring?

Many flowers contain both sex elements in themselves, though some do not. Is it unthinkable that a “sport,”

in which the divine power produced the male element beside the female one and then united the two, might appear in one sporadic instance? Do we know enough to presume to set bounds for God?

The virgin birth eliminated the depraving human heredity which has always operated and still operates to cripple God's influence with men. It also supplied the needed human element without giving it a dominating position. Furthermore, it made possible a creature in whom free-will — both human and divine — could manifest itself fully and meet human temptations without sin. In short, a virgin birth was not merely the only logical process, it was actually the only possible process, if the work of redemption was to be undertaken at all.

From this conclusion there is no escape, since free-will is an essential element not only of the Godhead but also of God manifest in the flesh. No human being, if wholly human, could possibly have the necessary free-will and still fulfill the requirements which the case demanded, and no such agent ever did. Christ, therefore, was no mere man, and he certainly was not a bastard of uncertain parentage. But if we reject his divine virgin birth, bastardy is the necessary alternative, as all the evidence goes to show.

We are thus shut up to one conclusion. He was the Son of God; for God was his progenitor in the sense that He alone caused Mary to conceive. No human proxy was involved, and there were no omitted ancestors. It is therefore useless to refer to Luke's "Son of God" as it appears in his genealogical list, as if that could cover the

ground. Adam was a created son, rather than a begotten one in the sense in which Jesus was begotten, and God had no need of a younger (human) brother's help to raise up seed for him!

Christ therefore had divine powers such as no mere man ever possessed or was capable of possessing, and he had the ability to use them whenever and wherever there was any real need of doing so.

Without such powers he could not have been God manifest in the flesh, and their absence would have been conclusive proof that he was not God so manifest. Herein lies the rationality of the miracles or signs which he did; for that is the real meaning of the word commonly used to cover his peculiar works, and that is the meaning of the works themselves. They were the signs of his divinity. He used them sparingly and never without due cause.

"Natural laws" are not laws in fact. They are merely such of the Creator's methods of work as we are familiar with in our limited natural environment. They are the ways in which He works in our human experience. The possibility remains that He may have other ways of working of which we know nothing here. Incandescent hydrogen is an impossibility in this world, except in a vacuum or in the process of combustion. It loses all stability.

In the sun, however, without combustion and in the presence of oxygen, it is a constant element. Conditions differ there, and results differ also. No oxygenation, or oxidation, takes place in the sun, and hydrogen is not consumed there. Neither are the other elements, which, if incandescent, would know no such exemption on this

planet. Chemistry is one thing here. It is another there. Men forget that.

Chemists once ridiculed the idea that the gases composing water could be separated by heat; but the process now used in making water-gas comes very near to doing exactly that.

Our knowledge, in reality, is extremely limited. God, however, has been master, down through the ages, not only of what we already know but also of all that we can ever hope to know, in addition to the things that will always be beyond our ken. He knows the laws governing the composition of the atom and all the other secrets of physics and chemistry. All are his workmanship.

Without a primeval intelligence, they become unthinkable. But with such an intelligence God becomes a logical necessity and is once more postulated. Moreover, He cannot be bound by the limits of human knowledge and experience. He is a law unto himself, save that certain limitations are imposed upon Him by his moral characteristics and his beneficence.

What, then, shall be said of Evolution? It is the storm center of all the discussions between liberals and conservatives and cannot, therefore, be ignored. So acrimonious, indeed, has the debate been, that justice can hardly be done to either side without arousing resentment in the other.

Both go too far, and both should face conditions rather than waste their energies on inconclusive theories. Both do just that, and the bare fact that they resent the charge so hotly proves the point.

Scientific evolution, as taught by Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, and others of their school, is plainly materialistic, even if Huxley did ridicule the idea, and Darwin's minute changes were a logical outcome of the premises. Connecting links, monstrosities that did not survive because not fit to do so, — this is not the same thing as "the survival of the fittest," — and eons of time were inevitable factors in the problem. Sudden changes are not evolution: they are Mutation.

Moreover, scientific evolution exactly parallels the teachings of Leucippus, Democritus, Epicurus, and Lucretius, all of whom antedate our era, and they were avowedly atheistic. Evolution is accordingly the natural enemy of both deism and theism. It is opposed to divine agencies and insists that nature alone is sufficient for the task involved.

Theism and evolution are therefore by nature mutually exclusive, evolution is an unproved hypothesis — some of its own advocates admit that much — which must be taken on faith, and it is illogical, inasmuch as it presupposes as a part of its *modus operandi* that the lower can be an adequate cause for the higher. Without that supposition, God becomes necessary.

Evolution did away with "Design"; but it has been driven to readmit the basic idea under the term, "Teleology." Things do tend to develop toward definite ends. But — that implies intelligence, which points to God again.

Since the late seventies many changes have occurred. The monkey theory has been abandoned in spite of Haeckel and Darwin, men and apes are now said to have had a

parallel development, and German blood tests — even if they have been shown to be anything but reliable — are supposed to indicate that birds and snakes, and horses and walruses, are as nearly related as men and apes are. Meanwhile, biological teachings seem to point to a line of development including the hog, the tapir, and the elephant!

Nevertheless, theologians have grown enthusiastic over evolution, while scientists have laughed or even sneered. How could that have taken place, if evolution did not have within itself something to recommend it? And why have students decided to abandon their religion rather than give up evolution, in case a choice had to be made? I have reason to know that to be true.

The modern student is "from Missouri." He must be shown. It is therefore futile to tell him that man is not the product of evolution; for God created him in his own image.

Just what does that mean? Does it mean that God has arms and legs and a head? If it does not, it is not pertinent and patently begs the question; for evolution deals primarily with man's body and with nothing else. If it does so mean, however, it is preposterous; for God is a spirit, and man's personality, not his physical body, is what is referred to in Genesis.

Again, does it mean that God said, "Let man be," and man was, as Minerva is said to have sprung full-grown and armed from the brain of Zeus? That, too, is preposterous; for the argument, "He never works that way now," must hold here as well as in evolution or else

be abandoned altogether, and, as Huxley puts it, there is great difficulty in believing that "complex organic beings made themselves (for that is what creation comes to in scientific language) out of inorganic matter." God did not work that way with Jesus. He used processes that were unequivocally developmental. Did He change his methods then and there? or complete them?

Lucretius teaches that the earth was the mother of all; but his teaching is not acceptable. Facing these things, some of the strongest opponents of evolution have finally been driven to conclude that God made an image of dust and turned it into a man.

That is absurd on the face of it, and it has no warrant in the Hebrew text; for He is forming us out of dust to-day — developmentally, through food. Is it surprising that so many thinking men are convinced that God must have originally used developmental processes of some sort?

To those who do not see the mischief it has wrought and are not aware of its contradictions and the difficulties it involves, evolution, backed by Comparative Anatomy, seems like a simple, natural, and reasonable way out of their difficulties.

That is why they talk of "theistic evolution," which not only spells pantheism but is self-contradictory. What they seem to have in mind is theistic mutation, which has no quarrel either with pure theism or with the Bible. That might, possibly, include Jesus as its culmination. Conservatives should therefore face these particulars squarely. They have dodged them long enough. Generalities will not answer evolutionists.

Now, observe this one thing. It applies with especial force to those who have the most difficulty with a virgin birth and a divine Savior; for, if they accept the teachings of evolution and agree that the higher forms have been developed in some way from the lower, they are thereby estopped from assuming that a highest form (a divine person) could not be produced from a human mother under proper conditions. The New Testament furnishes such conditions.

They are accordingly under obligation to accept its teachings, unless they can show that no such conditions were ever possible or would so operate. This they never can do, and the miracle of the virgin birth must stand.

The fact that it is a miracle is the chief difficulty. Men maintain that miracles are not necessary to the Christian religion, and there is truth in the contention, since miracles cannot give or take away the eternal verities which Christ came to teach. Christianity must therefore stand, even if miracles are discarded by some believers. Its claims are too imperative to be ignored.

Nevertheless, any doctrine of that sort is fallacious, because it ignores patent and basic facts. If the power to work miracles is once taken away from Christ, there remains no conclusive evidence of his divine nature and authority, and no adequate means are left whereby he can be differentiated from other great religious teachers. He is thus reduced to their level.

His "signs" were an integral part of his mission upon earth; for they set the seal of God upon him and upon his teachings. It is impossible to eliminate them and still

keep him, unless he was merely a good man with a master mind, but deluded.

Consider how intimately his miracles are interwoven with his life story. If you take them out, what of importance is left except his teachings? Unique and unparalleled as these are, there are other vital considerations.

In the first place, who is credulous enough to believe that a merely human Jesus could have taken a few ignorant fishermen, with an occasional person having a trained mind, and then, leaving them with no written instructions and no financial backing, have so effectually defied the religious leaders of his day that those same men, after he had suffered the most ignominious of deaths, would be able to overpower organized, conservative, traditional Judaism and not only build up a church in Jerusalem but even in Rome itself?

Why has not this feature of the situation been weighed by either liberal or rationalist? Is it rational to ignore it? Here are men of the lower classes confounding religious leaders, overcoming persecution, gaining converts in the very strongholds of Judaism and heathenism, and preaching boldly and successfully in spite of all opposition. Even death itself did not deter them. They preached still and built up the Church.

That they did so is beyond question. Thus, when treating of the reputed burning of Rome by Nero, Tacitus (*Ann.* xv. 44) has this to say:—

“Accordingly, to destroy the rumor, Nero substituted as culprits and punished with the most extraordinary penalties, those whom hated on account of infamous acts, the common people called Chris-

tians. The author of this name, Christus, in the reign of Tiberius, suffered capital punishment at the hands of a procurator, Pontius Pilate; and, though checked for a while, the deadly superstition again broke forth, not only all over Judea, the source of the evil, but also all over the city (of Rome), where all atrocious or shameful things from everywhere congregate and receive honor."

This is sufficiently explicit to satisfy almost any one.

With it may be put another item, from Josephus (*Antiq.* XVIII. iii. 3), which men have tried so desperately to destroy: —

"Now, there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man, for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews, and many of the Gentiles. He was [the] Christ. And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men amongst us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third day, as the divine prophets had foretold these and ten thousand other wonderful things concerning him. And the tribe of Christians, so named from him, are not extinct at this day." (Whiston's Translation.)

Men dispute the authenticity of this passage; but it is said to be found in all the manuscripts, it was quoted twice by Eusebius about the year 325 A.D., — once to convince the Jews of Christ's Messiahship, — and its interpolation, either in whole or in part, by Christians was an utter impossibility.

A Jew wrote it, and he wrote it for Roman readers. Men forget that. In what possible way, then, could Christians interpolate such a passage and leave no trace behind them, with the deadly hostility of both Jews and Romans to prevent them from attempting such a barefaced fraud?

The amount of credulity required to accept the notion that Christians could do such a thing and get away with it is plainly colossal. Men forget also that Josephus promised in his preface to tell everything exactly as he found it recorded, omitting nothing. And they assume, without a particle of justification, that he must have understood the word Christ as we understand it.

That notion is utterly unwarranted. It is unscientific. And it lacks historical perspective. Josephus actually said, ὁ Χριστὸς οὗτος ἦν, as a means of identifying the Jesus to whom he referred. This (Jesus) was the (one called) Christ, is what he meant; for he has eight or nine others and invariably identifies them by some similar item such as "son of," naming the father. In one instance he uses a brother for the purpose.

There is therefore no need of bracketing the article before Christ. A failure to understand Josephus was the cause of that. He was not confessing that Jesus was the Messiah, even if he did mention the prophets — the "scapegoat Messiah" still puzzles the Jews. He was simply chronicling a fact as he found it — "This was the Christos (Jesus)." He meant no more than that, and no one should accuse him of meaning more.

Near the close of his history (XX. ix. 1), he mentions James, "the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ," plainly indicating his position and implying that he had already had something to say of this Jesus. He does not say "that Jesus" or "the Jesus," as he certainly would have done otherwise. He refers to him as to one previously mentioned.

Men who have ceased to believe in the resurrection naturally wish to be well rid of this passage in Josephus. It is fatal to their assumption that none took place. What they actually do is to exchange faith for credulity, since they must explain how an impossible thing was done, if their contention is to hold and be accepted as rational.

Their opposition to the resurrection is camouflaged by a judicious silence concerning it; for, being ministers and theological professors of high standing, they fear to lose their fat salaries if they speak out plainly and tell what they really believe, or, rather, do not believe.

It all comes back to a merely human Jesus, and that is what he must have been if he did no "signs." It then devolves upon them to explain how he was able to work the miracle of the founding of his church.

Even after his resurrection and two separate appearances to them, the apostles were so completely demoralized and discouraged, in spite of his rebukes for their unbelief, that when Peter said what amounts in colloquial English to "I'm going to quit and go back to fishing," they said with emphasis that they would go too.

Peter said, literally, "I-withdraw to-be-a-fisher" (ἀλιεύς); for his exact words were, Ὑπάγω ἀλιεύειν. And they answered, Ἐρχόμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν σοί. They could have said it without the second and third words; but it would have been colorless and perfunctory. They put them in and so expressed their unqualified approval of the plan.

They went, and Jesus appeared the third time (Jo. xxi. 14) and gave Peter a commission to preach. That

settled it. He went back, and the day of Pentecost followed. Observe that Luke tells that story (Acts ii.), and he has been proved reliable even when disputed by historians. He was a physician, and his account is direct and simple. He describes no insane fanatic in Peter's case, and he tells the result — three thousand converted.

With no miracles, no resurrection, and no commission, do you imagine that Peter would have ventured to address a crowd in Jerusalem, where Jesus himself had been crucified? Can you believe such a tale as that? He did so. He condemned the crucifixion, and he got followers immediately. They knew that he was right. And they acted accordingly.

Men have tried hard to get rid of John's gospel. They have signally failed. It is combined with the other three in Tatian's *Diatessarōn*, now recovered and published, which was prepared in the second century, and the very title itself implies four gospels. Men overlooked that and thought it would help them dispose of John. His testimony about Peter's commission to "feed my lambs" and "feed my sheep" therefore remains. Peter did so.

Is it possible to escape the conclusion, when once the true significance of discarding either the miracles or the resurrection is appreciated, that any such course, taken to be rid of miracles, simply leads to other and far less credible miracles, as an inescapable necessity if the contention that Christ worked none is to hold?

How can Peter's sermon be accounted for? How can the stories in Acts be explained? How can Christ be differentiated from Mohammed or Buddha? Is it suffi-

cient to accept the supposition that he had strong limbs, a powerful will, a ruddy countenance, boundless enthusiasm, unlimited self-confidence, and superior intellectual acumen, along with a cheerful disposition, if we are to know him for what he was? Can you stop there and be satisfied?

Were his works mere legerdemain, as the Jews still believe? What think ye of Christ? Was he nothing more than a powerful man? Was he that? Simon of Cyrene bore his cross for him. Why, unless he was too worn and weak to do so? Was it his body or his spirit that mattered? Ah, that matchless spirit! Was not that the thing that made him the Son of God? Was he anything less than that?

CHAPTER VII.

AN ARGUMENT FROM ANALOGY.

NATURAL law is a fetish. Men invoke it on all sorts of occasions. They employed it to "prove" the impossibility of deep-sea life. They now declare that it makes miracles unbelievable. They rush to its protecting presence to escape the claims of Christianity. And they think that their position is impregnable.

They thought so in the deep-sea matter; but fishes kept right on living there, as every one now knows, and, in a similar way, miracles of grace have continued to be performed in the lives of sinful men. In a sense, also, physical miracles have been done; for a miracle is not an impossibility, as many suppose, but a suspension of natural laws by the operation of others of a higher type.

The truth is that the modern conception of a miracle is utterly unscriptural. Christ did "signs" or "wonders" and "powers." That is what the New Testament really teaches, and "miracle" itself properly means a wonder. For us, Christ's "signs" would be miracles indeed; but for him they were of so little moment that he actually promised the apostles that they should do greater works than he had done, and, in a way, they did.

He seems to have referred to the miracles that were to be wrought in the lives of sinful men, and, from his standpoint, such wonders would be greater than any of the things which he did with disease and death.

To the source of life, which he had within himself, the overcoming of disease and death must of necessity be an easy task, but the renewing of life in the spiritually dead which involves the making over of a human will, would be another matter. That was to be the work of the apostles, they were to persuade men; and their successors, with his help, are still doing that kind of "greater works," as he himself implied that they would do.

Men constantly suspend natural laws. They overcome inertia and gravitation with every movement which they make. A telephone cannot be used without overcoming a law of nature; for the voice is carried far beyond its normal scope. Nay, wireless telegraphy, to say nothing of radio and transatlantic telephoning, may fairly be called a modern miracle because of its remarkable character. But—it was not impossible.

It is a "wonder" beyond any question, and a few years ago it would have been regarded as a physical impossibility, or a miracle in the modern sense of that word. Recent discoveries, however, concerning the effects of an oscillatory discharge of an electric circuit have made it not only possible but an everyday occurrence.

Men have just mastered this particular field in the domain of electricity; but the Creator must have been aware of all its peculiarities from the very beginning. He also knows untold other things in the physical world that men have found it impossible to fathom. He may therefore be able to produce results that are not only not possible for men to obtain, but are also beyond the limits of their comprehension.

He made and He rules the universe. His power is therefore not to be limited by man's conception of what is possible or what is not. Things that are impossible for men may be extremely easy for God, or well within His powers of accomplishment.

A miracle, then, is merely something beyond human attainment, but a possible and normal act on the part of the deity. Those who venture to set limits beyond which the deity cannot go are accordingly not burdened with an overwhelming modesty.

Within our limited experience we know how He does certain things. We also know that His methods are uniform. If they were not, we could not maintain life on this planet. What other methods He may have we do not know. We cannot, in the nature of things. A hint along those lines, however, has recently been vouchsafed us.

One substance has been found, though not yet isolated, which not only flatly contradicts but also practically upsets what have hitherto been regarded as fixed and unvarying laws of nature.

It does this, moreover, all along the line. Every one of its qualities, with hardly any variation, differs from those of most other known substances. This, at least, is what the testimony of the men who have had experience with it would indicate.

Nothing can be self-luminous without being at the same time incandescent. That is, or was supposed to be, a law of nature. Radium salts, however, have no respect for that law; they shine right along in spite of it, if

physicists can be believed, since they always exhibit, in addition to the radioactivity that is characteristic of them, autoluminescence; and they involve in this peculiarity their kindred substances, uranium, thorium, polonium, actinium, and the various compounds that are made from those substances.

The laws of nature therefore "prove" that radium chlorid and radium bromide are impossibilities! The process of reasoning is exactly that used in connection with miracles, and it is about equally effective. What shall we do? Is it rational to accept radium as a real substance or must we conclude that it is a mere notion, residing in and produced by the excited imagination of over-enthusiastic physicists? Miracles suffer that fate at their hands. Why not radium at ours?

But, wait a moment. It is also a law of nature that all material substances take on the temperature of the surrounding air or objects. But radium chlorid and radium bromide refuse to comply with that law and remain a few degrees warmer than their environment. That, at least, is what their sponsors say. Is it rational to accept such testimony? Do not the laws of nature forbid it? Is such a miracle believable?

But that is not all; for they actually assert that these salts send off constantly a stream of emanations with incredible speed, thus defying the law of gravitation. Shades of Lucretius! What is a rationalist to think of that?

Moreover, some of these emanations are actually said to produce another element, helium! Is that a scientific

fact, or is it merely "a yarn for the marines"? Furthermore, liquid air, a white-hot furnace, pressure, explosives, and electrical charges all fail to stop this radioactivity. Phew!

Again, radium emanations, properly so called, constitute an autoluminescent gas of the argon family, so the authorities say if they have not changed their minds, and radium atoms are therefore believed to be unstable systems, radium itself being the product of disintegrated uranium. Here is the fundamental doctrine of the old alchemists actually come to life again!

It was long regarded as an exploded fancy of foolish dreamers, although some persisted in believing that it might contain the germs of a mighty truth, and now it is coming into its own.

But there is more of this scientific "pipe-dream." Ionium is said to be one product of the disintegration of uranium, actinium and radium, or their salts, being others. Polonium is another, — there are nine in all, — and it is supposed that common lead is the ultimate resulting substance. Accepted natural laws are thus upset with a vengeance! What next?

Hold on, my scientific friend, don't throw the book down with disgust. Read on and get the rest of the object lesson. It will do you good and help you to see how nonsensical some things sound to us.

Nothing burns unless it is hot. And yet they tell us that radium salts, if carried in the pocket, produce burns on the human skin that are extremely difficult to heal. Here is another natural law gone to smash.

Radium salts also take photographs, they say, and they do it through substances impervious to light. "We are from Missouri." Don't forget that!

Not content with that Munchausenism, physicists report that radium salts will melt their own weight of ice in an hour and continue to do it indefinitely.

Other peculiar properties are attributed to this remarkable substance called radium; but enough has been said to meet the needs of this discussion in that direction.

What is the evidence available for most persons concerning this extraordinary chemical? The newspapers — proverbially inaccurate sources of information! And yet it is accepted by all. Rationalists and men from Missouri are no exceptions to the rule, and they ask no questions and make no remarks. Why?

Simply because no one believes that any such testimony could be sent abroad, to say nothing of its being placed in books of reference as it is, unless it had beneath it a solid basis of fact supported by competent witnesses. Such a position is perfectly sound. Deception in this would be impossible, not to say unthinkable, since it would be a fake too gigantic for men to perpetrate, even if scientific theory is notoriously unstable.

It never seems to occur to our rationalistic friends that the Gospel story occupies a similar field and one equally impossible to fake. Intense hostility faced Jesus all through his life and ministry; for the doctors of the law never forgot or forgave, as tradition in Jerusalem even now bears witness, the twelve-year-old boy who spoke of the temple as his Father's.

Slanders concerning his birth followed him from infancy. He suffered the extreme infamy of the cross. And yet, in spite of all that, he established his church upon earth, or enabled his disciples to do so. He began it on the day of Pentecost by convicting of sin thousands of men through the foolishness of preaching, and the preacher himself was only a common illiterate fisherman.

His most deadly foe, Saul, the fanatic, this same Jesus turned into his most faithful and energetic servant, Paul, the evangelist. He began, in short, to turn the world upside down, and he is still at it.

The thing cannot be explained on any theory of evolution. It cannot be accounted for on the basis of hallucination. It does not yield to the supposition that he and his followers were and are deluded fanatics. It refuses to be analyzed as the result of enthusiasm. In short, no rational hypothesis can be found to account for the events recorded in the Gospels or for the Gospels themselves, save the supposition that the story is true.

Now, note the curious parallelism that is to be found in the premises thus outlined. A single man with a small group of followers, who exhibit his characteristics and powers after a fashion, is represented as upsetting and controlling the laws and forces of nature; and a single substance, with a small group of allied substances, which show similar peculiarities to a slight degree, appears in the scientific world and likewise upsets and controls the laws and forces of nature.

This substance converts oxygen into ozone, changes ordinary phosphorus into the red variety, decomposes

water and appears to alter the relative bulk of the oxygen and hydrogen obtained, darkens the color of diamonds, mica, quartz, and glass, and acts as a germicide with various microorganisms.

No one questions these latter facts. They are scientific! They have been tested! But how about the Gospels? What of the untold thousands who have put them to the test? Have any such numbers tested the powers of radium as have tested those of Jesus Christ? Has radium any such cloud of witnesses to substantiate its claims?

And if Peter is likened to the newspapers, what of Paul? Erudite, keen, mercilessly hostile to Jesus, with an intellect not only trained to the highest degree but also superbly gifted, this skeptical Jew became the first and greatest of Christian theologians.

What will you do with him? He must be accounted for in some rational way. Can the thing be done on the assumption that he was simply a deluded fanatic? Can it be done on any assumption, save the single one that the Gospel story is true?

In some respects his experience was unique. In some, also, its results were unique. In others, however, it accorded with that of all true believers; for it completely made over the entire man, as it has made over thousands of others on the testimony of both themselves and their neighbors, and it reversed his whole plan of life. It has a habit of doing that — by changing the mainspring.

All this is a matter of inner experience. Does that make it unscientific? Science, they say, is based on experience. Well, Christianity is also based on experi-

ence, and it is the most profound and remarkable experience that comes to men. Those who have been through it, in any true sense, all testify to the accuracy of that statement.

It cannot, indeed, be examined with a microscope, which is the sort of experience that science relies on; but neither can a mother's love. Has that no standing as a scientific fact?

Moreover, is such scientific observation always reliable? Is it universally applicable? Can electricity be so examined or even known? Are not its effects, like those of a mother's love, the only things we have by which we can hope to know it? Has any one ever seen pure radium? We know it by its effects. May we not also know a genuine Christianity by its effects?

Now, observe this curious anomaly. A substance, the possibility of whose very existence no physicist on earth would for an instant admit, unless he had the most convincing evidence that the existence of such a substance had been demonstrated scientifically by proper chemical processes, is nevertheless accepted by most persons without question, on the unsupported testimony of the newspapers, — accepted, mind you, — without even asking for corroborative evidence; and yet large numbers of the same people allow countless Christian books and Christian lives to count for nothing in the decision reached by them concerning Jesus.

No historical facts are better attested than are those of his life. He appears in the "Annals" of Tacitus (xv. 44) along with Pilate, who is said to have condemned

him, and he figures in the "Antiquities of the Jews" by Josephus (XVIII. iii. 3), who chronicles both his death and his resurrection — to the utter disgust of the critics, who have tried their best to destroy the passage.

Every extant manuscript has it, however, and as early as about 324-330 A.D. it was cited twice by Eusebius, one of the church fathers, who quotes it in full in one place (H.E., I. xi. 7 f.) and then uses it again (Dem. Ev., III. iii. 105 f.) in an effort to convince the Jews of the truth of the Gospels. It was also cited by others.

Neither the passage in Josephus nor that in Tacitus can be disposed of as an interpolation by Christian scribes. To begin with, that would have been forgery, and, with the hostility of the whole literary world to combat, such a thing would have been an utter impossibility.

But suppose such an attempt had been made. Could it have been carried out with a success so overwhelming that the secret remained undiscovered for centuries? That is what the critics would have us believe. No other conclusion is possible, in case either passage is not genuine.

Does the testimony of the manuscripts count for less than their own unbelief and determined opposition to the truth? Josephus engaged himself, in his preface, to tell the whole truth exactly as he found it. He kept his word, and that meets every difficulty of the critics except their own unbelief; for Jewish rabbis recognize a "scape-goat Messiah" as well as a kingly one, and consistency is a decidedly modern virtue.

Again, certain conditions appear in a letter of the Younger Pliny (xcvii.), in which he informs the Emperor Trajan that he finds evidence of "an absurd and extravagant superstition" among the Christians of his day; but these conditions find their natural explanation in the supposition that Christians were then still commemorating the resurrection, as well as observing the Lord's supper and binding themselves to live soberly and righteously.

Moreover, the Gospels have every characteristic of a sane narration of fact. Not a flaw appears in their structure which could possibly indicate that they were the result of a forgery, and their very nature forbids such an assumption. Furthermore, the entire opposition to Christianity has always been based on hatred and an unwillingness to submit to the demands of a Christian life, and it has always consisted, in large measure, of ridicule concerning the basic facts, and of unbelief respecting the authority, of the Gospels.

If, however, a new element can be allowed to upset the whole theory of matter itself, as radium certainly has done, is it unreasonable to assume that the deity might possibly do a few things out of the ordinary, when present on earth in the flesh? If He was not so present, Christianity is an unfathomable mystery and a gigantic miracle with endless ramifications.

It is therefore impossible to be rid of miracles in any event, and the whole problem reduces itself to the two horns of a dilemma. Which sort of miracle is the more rational?

Moreover, if the divinity of Jesus is to be challenged, how about the peculiar claims of radium? Which has the better backing? With which does personal experience range itself?

The case is now complete. Radium is acquitted at the bar of public opinion of being anything like a fake. Christianity is accepted, by those who know it best, not only as genuine but also as man's most precious possession. Is it the part of wisdom to deny either? Is it the part of wisdom to deny to Jesus the divinity which he claimed?

What, then, shall we think? Simply this. What radium is to all other material substances, that Jesus Christ is to all other men. Each is unique. Each must be allowed to stand unchallenged. And each must be recognized as unlike all other similar things.

CHAPTER VIII.

CERTAIN CONSIDERATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

THE virgin birth is not the only thing that has been assailed, in our day, in the house of its friends. The Bible itself has been so assailed, and men have actually prided themselves on their accomplishments in that direction.

This may be said to have begun in France in 1753, when an aged physician, who is charged with having been a debauchee, published certain conjectures of his own concerning Genesis, because he wished to account for its peculiarities in the use of the words Elohim and Jahveh (Yahweh). Their employment was such that it conflicted with the canons of French style, and that simple fact suggested an inquiry into the origin of the usage found.

At that time, J. G. Eichhorn was an infant in arms. Approximately twenty-seven years later, say in 1780, having taken up the investigation, he invented, incidentally, the term, "higher criticism," made quite a stir in Biblical circles, and formally started the critical festivities.

Since then, learned theologians have, figuratively speaking, joined in the dance, ministers of various denominations have "balanced to partners," and some have even "done the tango" in the effort to be up to date.

For a time it seemed as though they would monopolize everything, and force the "wall-flowers" to dance with them; but the end now appears to be in sight, since textual criticism is slowly but surely destroying higher criticism, and the Massoretic Text is no longer regarded as the only basis for conclusions in such matters. Wiener and Dahse alone have already done enough to change all that, and the work is by no means completed. When it is finished, there will be very little left of higher criticism, even on a textual basis, to say nothing of the destructive effects of archaeological investigations.

Moreover, when the Bible is compared with other sacred books, such as the Rig-Veda, the Zend-Avesta, the Buddhistical writings, the Koran, the Lî Kî, the Shih King, the Yî King, and the Shû King, its superiority becomes more and more evident the deeper the investigator goes.

Indeed, the marvelous character of the book, with its unity and diversity, its simplicity and depth, its biography and song, its authoritative precepts and convincing logic, and its fascinating history and unique religious teachings, gradually assumes proportions so overwhelming that the unprejudiced reader is actually forced to the conclusion that the book is what it claims to be — the Word of God.

These things the critics have somehow failed to see. They have chased mere words with such vigor that they have had no time left for their content, for a careful consideration of Semitic psychology, or for religious meditation.

Having become obsessed with the evolutionary hypothesis, they have become both blind and deaf to various other

considerations. Some things in the book have undoubtedly been misinterpreted or overdrawn; but, when all due allowance has been made for any possibilities of that sort, enough remains to fill an unprejudiced mind with wonder and amazement, and to destroy the notion that "the Bible is just like any other book."

In some respects it is; but that view ignores its most salient features and denies its most important characteristics. No other book has ever done for men what it has done and is still doing, and no other book ever can. No other set of books ever can. In this it is unique, and unique it will remain.

The story of Pitcairn Island is a case in point. For ten years, nine white men, six Tahitians, and twelve Polynesian women lived a life of jealousy, outrage, and hate, until Alexander Smith was the only man left alive. By chance a Bible had been brought ashore with the fleeing mutineers, and he found it, providentially; for in the following twenty-four years of isolation every soul, young men, women, and children, had been reached and transformed so that their moral and religious character amazed all men. Could any other book do that?

Its very character is such that when critics accuse it of being a literary forgery, the accusation is branded by men on the street as an impossibility on its face. And yet, if the book is what the higher critics say that it is, it must of necessity be a fraud, even if it be a "pious" one. How, then, is it to be explained that that same book is the most powerful agent that can be found for the preclusion of any and all fraudulent transactions?

That is a well-known truth, and it cannot be a mere anomaly. If the book itself is a fraud, that peculiarity is nothing short of a miracle; for the fact that the Bible has the sort of influence over men that it does have is thus made incomprehensible.

If, on the contrary, it is what it claims to be, a growth and product of the ages at the hands of men inspired of God, there is nothing whatever about it that need occasion wonder. It is merely what it should be normally, under the conditions named, and it produces results that ought to be expected.

But there is another peculiarity about the Bible. It contains remarkable forecasts of events that took place long after they were foretold. How did Daniel know, for instance, that the four kingdoms which he pictured (ii. 31-35) would be of diminishing value but increasing strength, as he represents them, and that the last one would finally go to pieces? Did he fail to characterize them correctly? Will a "late date" cover all his details? Think it over.

Again, how did Ezekiel know that the stones of Tyre, its timbers, and its dust would one day be laid in the midst of the waters (xxvi. 4, 12-14), as they were, literally, by Alexander the Great? How did he know that Sidon would survive but that its streets would flow with blood (xxviii. 20-23), as they have done repeatedly? And how did he know that Egypt, long the most glorious of nations, would ultimately be debased after her cities had suffered the most awful catastrophies (xxix. 13-16, xxx. 4-18), as actually happened?

The Edomites, or Idumeans, have disappeared from the face of the earth. How did that prophecy of Obadiah (18) happen to come true? If Israel sinned, we read that it was to suffer certain definite things (Levit. xxvi. 27-34). Did any of them fail to materialize? Babylon, most magnificent of cities, was to be utterly desolate, forsaken (Is. xiii. 19-22). Is it without significance that the time came when men actually doubted the existence of such a city?

All of these prophecies and others like them go into minute details in certain particulars, and those details fit the historical facts as we now know them. Is it rational to assume that this is a matter of mere coincidence?

Efforts have been made to get rid of the prophetic element; but they are unavailing. Even the claims of a much more recent date for the writings than that which tradition has assigned them are going to pieces as we come to know their history better. The Septuagint or Greek Version of the Old Testament antedates our era, even in its completed form, by at least two centuries.

That indicates a far greater age for the Hebrew Bible, since there would have been no occasion for the vast labor involved in translating and copying by hand so large a work for extensive use, unless the Bible had already come to be regarded, by those who used it, as a most important authority.

It was not only important: it was also sacred. But this can only mean that it was even then very old in the year 280 B.C., when the Septuagint appears to have been begun. Where, then, did the various authors of the Book

get their information concerning events that were to take place as late as our own era, if not in our own day? And how did they happen to hit the nail so squarely on the head in every instance? The agreements are certainly most remarkable.

Now, in the case of Israel, the results of disobedience, both immediate and remote, were foretold by Moses with astonishing detail (Lev. xxvi. 14-45; Deut. xxviii. 58-68), and they were fulfilled to the letter, even in the matter of Israelites becoming a drug in the slave markets of Egypt.

That actually happened, apparently, in 135 A.D., when Hadrian finally dispersed the rebellious Jews. But the Jews were not to perish as a separate and distinct people (Lev. xxvi. 44-45), and they still retain their identity in various parts of the earth where they have been scattered.

How are these things to be explained? Is it less rational to assume that the Bible is what it claims to be than it is to decide that these fulfilments of prophecy are to be accounted for on the supposition that the authors of the predictions have all chanced to be lucky enough to have uttered things that could be made to fit later events with exactness down to the least detail?

Is the Bible "just like any other book"? Are the higher critics right in so declaring? Have they really any sort of a case? Careful comparisons by textual critics have already shown that many variations have occurred in the use of *Elohim*, *Jahveh*, and *Elohim Jahveh*, in the various versions of the Pentateuch,

including Hebrew manuscripts that preceded the Massoretic Text as we now have it, and that stock phrases, such as those upon which the higher critics rely for differences in style, have occasionally been interpolated not only in the Versions so called (the ancient translations) but also in the Massoretic Text itself.

In other words, the foundations upon which the higher critics have built have no real existence, but are merely subjective notions of brilliant and ingenious men whose judgment has been perverted by intellectual pride.

Archaeology is adding its testimony to that of the textual critics, and higher criticism is doomed. The Bible of tradition will yet be restored to us; but the attacks upon it will have wrought a useful purpose. Some things will be different, many will be better understood, certain "miracles" (not all) will be replaced by "mediate miracles," or by "special providences" timed to act in conjunction with known forces of nature, God's "messengers" (the Hebrew reading) of death will be recognized as germs of bubonic plague rather than an angel sent from heaven, and some verses will be retranslated; but the general result will be a firm conviction that the reliability of Bible statements is beyond question, although it is always possible to misunderstand and misinterpret them.

Now, this same book contains repeated references to Christ, and they begin in the oldest documents. The woman's seed (the Messiah) was to bruise the serpent's head (Gen. iii. 15); in Abram (through the Messiah) all the families of the earth were to be blessed (Gen. xii. 3); Messias, typified by Solomon, was to have dominion from

sea to sea (Ps. lxxii. 8); he was to have pity on the poor, and all nations were to call him blessed (*ibid.* 13, 17); he was not to remain in the abode of the dead (xvi. 10); his enemies were to be made his footstool (cx. 1); and he was to be a priest forever after the order of Melchizedek (*ibid.* 4). These are but a few of the things said of him, and they are of the obscure type at that; but they have been understood for many ages as having reference to the Messiah in a direct and positive way.

While they may be set aside with the help of the usual subterfuges, — although they, with many others, including even more than the New Testament has recognized, were long understood and interpreted by the Jews as having reference to him who was to come in the fulness of time, the Messiah king, — there are plenty of others, especially in Isaiah, which cannot be so treated.

Indeed, so explicit are Isaiah's details and so minute are the resemblances between them and the facts of Christ's life and death, that Jewish rabbis actually warn their younger associates to beware of that prophet and not to read him overmuch, lest they become apostates or *meshum-mads*. They explain his apparent contradictions of Messianic expectations by saying that he refers to a "scape-goat Messiah." An earthly kingdom, not a heavenly one in the hearts of men, is still their idea of what the Messiah is to set up on earth.

The whole Old Testament, in reality, was understood by the Jews as foreshadowing a kingly Messiah, and their hope was as marvelous as it was unique; but as time passed they exaggerated the kingly features and forgot

all others so that they were blinded to the true nature of the Kingdom that was to be set up and fill the whole earth (Dan. ii. 34 f., 44 f.), and they fondly imagined that they were to lord it over the rest of mankind, an idea which many believe is not yet wholly eradicated from their inner consciousness. When Jesus failed to set up an earthly kingdom after the events of Palm Sunday, they crucified him in their fury.

A spiritual kingdom, one dominating the hearts of men, — the only thing really worth dominating, — was quite beyond their comprehension, and it is so even now. They still understand a selfish basis in the lives of their fellows; but an unselfish one is even yet something unbelievable and wholly Utopian. They are always wondering what the ulterior motive is behind the professed one, and that is one reason why so many of them distrust Christians.

The Book of Daniel, just referred to, is not beloved by the critics. They would reduce it, in fact, to a pretty bit of fiction written to encourage the Jews in a time of stress, or, in other words, to a Palestinian forgery of the Maccabaeian age, very much as they would set aside many other parts of the Old Testament, and the inherent improbability that any early Jewish document was a piece of fiction rather than an effort to set forth and explain some unusual occurrence is wholly lost to their comprehension. Even the Book of Job is probably based on an actual life experience of some prominent patriarch, just as Homer's poems are now known to have had an historical foundation. The proof of that fact is clear and explicit, and it should give the critics pause.

The strongest point made by them against Daniel relates to its position in the Hebrew canon. They forget that the "prophets" dealt with the fate of Israel and its foes. That simple fact rules Daniel out, and the Hebrews placed it where it rightly belongs, among the "sacred writings." It has nothing to do with Israel as such, and the change of position is not an improvement. It is, in fact, merely a Septuagintal blunder. The Massoretic Text is more reliable in some matters than any of the Versions or later translations, and it cannot be omitted from the reckoning even in such matters as this. Daniel's prophetic teachings had reference to the Gentile world mainly, and to class him with the "prophets" was entirely out of the question for a Hebrew canon, even if a Greek translation by Hebrews did put him there.

The assumed Maccabaeon date, which is supposed to explain most of the details in the prophetic utterances, fails to cover certain important items. In one passage (ix. 26), Messiah was to "be cut off, but not for himself" (A.V.), or to "be cut off, and have nothing" (R.V.), and, in the same connection, the time was set. There were to be sixty-nine weeks between the command to rebuild Jerusalem and the contemplated cutting-off.

Much has been written concerning this passage, and most of it has been unsatisfactory. Permission to build, many think, is not a command to do so, — they overlook Ezra v. 1 and vi. 1-5, which involve a command, — and that points, they say, to the decree of Artaxerxes, given at the request of Nehemiah (Neh. ii. 4-8), as the initial date.

The word rendered "week" really means a septad, or seven, so that, as Philip Mauro, in his "The Seventy Weeks and the Great Tribulation," has admirably shown, there were in all seventy sevens, and each septad was a period of years. But seven times sixty-nine gives 483 as the number of years that came between the decree and the cutting-off, and that fact has led to much speculation, as well as to various explanations.

In his "Wonders of Prophecy," John Urquhart regards the years as periods of 360 days, so that they would cover but 476 of our years of $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, and he thus reaches 30 A.D. as the date of the crucifixion, allowing at least four years for the error in our modern chronology. He gives the date of the decree of Artaxerxes, issued in the twentieth year of his reign, as 446 B.C., and he thinks that the sixty-nine sevens began at that time and ended with the crucifixion.

More recent, more accurate, and much more satisfactory is the explanation of Philip Mauro, who notes (pp. 25 ff.) that Isaiah (xliv. 28, xlv. 1-4, 13) definitely mentions Cyrus as the man who is to restore Jerusalem, and he accordingly places the beginning of the sevens at the issuing of the decree of Cyrus, which authorized both the return and the rebuilding. It specified the temple; but that implied houses to live in and was the real or vital element in the whole matter. In the first year, then, that Cyrus was sole ruler, he issued the command that caused the Jews to rebuild. That was in 457 B.C., although some think that Ezra's journey to Jerusalem occurred a year earlier.

In all, as stated, there were to be seventy sevens, or 490 years. They are divided into seven sevens, sixty-two sevens, and a final seven. The first one, amounting to 49 years, Mauro regards as the period of "troublous times" (Dan. ix. 25) at the rebuilding of the city. The second one, comprising 434 years, covers, he thinks, the time that elapsed between the end of that struggle and the appearance of "Messiah, the Prince." He therefore places the end of the 483 years at the baptism of Jesus, when he became the "anointed one" or the Messiah, and both dates are fixed with unusual precision in the Scriptural records (Ezra i. 1.; Luke iii. 1-2, 21-22).

The crucifixion marked the end of Jewish ritualism; but, according to the prophecy, the sacrifice and oblation were to cease in the midst of the seventieth week (Dan. ix. 27), which puts it three and a half years after the baptism, or at the end of his ministry. Every detail thus fits into the requirements; for the date of the crucifixion, on this basis, was 30 A.D., the date now generally accepted as correct.

Observe that this explanation is based wholly on the Scriptures and that it does not involve any Gentile speculations as to times and years. No manipulations of any sort are required to make things fit, and every detail is covered. The years are real years, and the Jewish intercalation is thus provided for. Their year was a solar one, although their month was lunar, and that fact must be met as well as the others.

After making all possible allowances for coincidences and other contingencies, here and elsewhere in Old Testa-

ment prophecy, an irreducible minimum is left that cannot be disposed of by any of the makeshifts employed by the critics. What shall be done with it? Can it be made to favor the critical view or must it be ranged on the side of the traditional one? And what if the traditional one should prove to be right? Accumulating evidence already shows that it will ultimately do so. What then? What will become of the "assured results of modern scholarship"? Will they continue to be "assured"?

Some of the prophecies were unquestionably fulfilled after they were uttered. No amount of squirming can possibly escape that conclusion, because the evidence is too general and too complex.

Collusion in the ancient documents was impossible from the very nature of the circumstances, as is made apparent in the case of the Jewish Massoretic Text of the Pentateuch and the Samaritan version of the same thing; for the two are in substantial agreement in all but a few points, — affecting certain matters in the ritual observances, — although the separation occurred as early as 432 B.C. and the Jews thereafter had no dealings with the Samaritans. Do these fulfilled prophecies offer any consolation to those who aver that all the prophecies were written after the event had occurred?

But if some of them surely antedate the events, and all of them profess to have done so, what is the rational conclusion concerning those in dispute? Tradition supports the contention that they antedated the things foretold. Is tradition to be summarily dismissed because certain modern scholars think it incumbent upon them

to demonstrate to a waiting world that it never knew wisdom until they arrived to teach sound reasoning?

What was the origin of the tradition at the start? Was it pure buncombe? Was it a mixture of truth and falsehood? Was it anything but an effort to tell the truth? Have falsifications been added purposely?

Is the present generation of rationalists so superior to all other preceding generations, in every domain of Biblical knowledge, that we must accept their dictum against any and every consideration? Or have they simply done as other men have done in other walks of life and put up a huge bluff for the sake of promoting their own individual interests? That is an extremely easy thing to do when once a man has been blinded by an exaggerated idea of his own importance. But if that is really the case, are we not justified in "calling" their bluff?

The truth is that it has been "called" and called emphatically; but the critics are deaf and blind when anything that does not agree with their particular views appears, and they continue to make claims that are not only preposterous but are also positively ridiculous — in the light of the things already accomplished.

The pity of it all is that they actually catch so many men with the bait of their pretensions and then succeed in heading them off from reading any other kind of literature dealing with the subject!

No real alarm need be felt; for the Book has stood that sort of thing for many centuries. Men have arisen who boasted that they would demolish it, and some have even

imagined that they had done so. The Book, however, keeps right on gaining in favor with all sorts and conditions of men, and it is multiplying its copies with amazing rapidity. Both considerations fit in with its avowed purpose, and it makes good wherever it is given a fair chance.

What, then, do its references to Christ mean? Are they merely fortuitous, or are they, in reality, significant? Do they tally with the facts, or do they violate them? And if they do so tally, and such references are in keeping with a divine purpose to redeem men, can we close our eyes to the significance of the prophecies in their bearing on the question: "What was Jesus?"

CHAPTER IX.

THE PERSONALITY OF JESUS.

IN the light of the things already said, what shall be thought of the personality of Jesus? Complex it must have been, and complex beyond the personality of ordinary men; for it necessarily involves elements that ordinary men know nothing about. Moreover, it has been the most amazing puzzle of the ages to all sorts and conditions of men.

Fathom it we cannot; and yet there is a possibility that we may be able to get some idea of what its true nature actually was. If we are to do so, however, we must go back to first principles and proceed from the known to the unknown as well as we can.

In every human child, as already intimated in Chapter III., there exist side by side the characteristics of the father and those of the mother. They may be mutually contradictory; and yet there they are with unmistakable distinctness — if only we have eyes to see. In case they are similar, no very marked peculiarities need be looked for so far as unexpected developments are concerned; but if they are dissimilar, then, at times, we may expect various anomalous traits to manifest themselves.

For example, a man may come from a mild and unobtrusive father and a forceful and independent mother. Such a man may be meekness itself until a blow is struck; but when it is struck he may disclose a most astonishing

capacity for self-defense or for the defense of his neighbor.

This fact may be illustrated by the following incident. A drunken bully in a crowded railway car began to pick on a mild and inoffensive little man, threatening to pull his nose for some foolish reason. The small man protested very gently, but that only seemed to anger the bully; with a sudden movement he caught hold of the threatened member.

Something happened. It was not on the program. The bully lay prone in the aisle, partially stunned and very much dazed. The fighting blood inherited from his mother had come to the surface, and the little man had acted accordingly. The bully was nearly twice his size; but that did not matter — he acted, and the bully saw the point so distinctly that he developed an astonishing respect for his intended victim, effusively begged his pardon, and swore eternal friendship for the mite who had “floored” him. It is a way bullies have.

Here were two independent and contrary traits in the same man, and either of them was capable of becoming characteristic of him. An inclination to be like his father, while still cherishing something of his mother’s forcefulness, caused him to act as he did. Her characteristics were allowed to lie dormant or but slightly developed, while those of his father were given free play. As a result, a lightning-like change was manifested when the proper motive appeared.

There are really within each of us three personalities — that of one’s father, that of his mother, and that of his

own individual self. The study of heredity goes more deeply into details in such matters than the above statement would indicate; for it brings up and considers remote as well as immediate ancestors, and it also takes note of various other things.

All of that, however, is beside the mark in this connection, and, for the purpose in hand, the outline here given is sufficiently accurate. Moreover, every one can test for himself its general truth in his own case and so recognize and analyze the facts as they appear in his own individual personality.

Was your father a silent, studious man, while your mother was rather given to sociability? Then you have both of these capacities lying dormant within you, and, while you may detest public speaking and shrink from facing an audience, you may still possess the ability to become an orator, even as John B. Gough did. It is largely a question of which characteristics you elect to follow.

In case you decide to develop all the latent possibilities inherited from two widely different parents, you may expect to become a person of extraordinary versatility. There will be danger, however, that you will never concentrate on any one thing with sufficient intensity to accomplish anything really worth while.

It is on some such basis as this, involving a complex personality, that we are constrained to explain the curious but evident fact that "Man is a paradox." There is no doubt about it. Moses, the meekest man, sins with his lips. Elijah, the heroic defender of the faith, before

Ahab and his host, runs at a woman's threat. Peter, valorous before the event, swears and denies even an acquaintance with Jesus after his arrest and then, in the end, lays down his life for him on a Roman cross. Finally, a most cowardly Arab, brought face to face with a lion and a lioness and their three cubs, calmly unslings his gun, kills the lion, and, an instant later, slays the lioness, drawing his two pistols before she can spring at him. The deed is seen, and he becomes thereafter, "The Lion of his Tribe," a name given him by his mates, just by way of appreciation.

It is said that a man's weak spot is always in the line of his greatest strength, and so indeed it seems. And his strong spot may be in the line of his greatest weakness, as it was in the case of the Arab, whose very desperation made him cool and resourceful.

That "we do not know what we will do until we get there" is largely true; and yet every previous act of our lives exerts some influence on the outcome when the test really comes. Latent powers may have been developed within us of which we have no knowledge, nor even a suspicion. Our choices have settled all that for us in advance, ordinarily.

What light, then, do these things throw on the personality of our Lord? Will they help us to apprehend it? Apparently they will. The infant child has no conscious development, although it learns an astonishing amount even in its first two years. It does make choices, however, and in making them reveals its innate traits and personal tendencies.

In Jesus we must therefore recognize the fact that the divine element was limited to the capacity of the infant brain until such time as that brain had reached the place where the boy's own personality could begin to exert itself either in the line of his mother's characteristics or in that of those of the Holy Spirit, which took the place of a father's characteristics in his complex personality.

The two would be widely different of necessity, and the boy must therefore have experienced a certain conflict of natures, such as that fact would inevitably involve. He must accordingly have felt himself drawn apart in a sense, as a natural consequence, and the experience must have come early in life.

At the age of twelve he seems to have fully realized the truth. If he did, he also began to appreciate what his mission on earth was to be like. Henceforth his development was along fixed and definite lines. He was consciously and steadily electing to follow the leadings of his divine nature, while just as constantly recognizing the claims of the human.

His own individual will — just as free as other wills, in growing children like himself — was daily choosing the characteristics and the guidance of the Holy Spirit. It was likewise daily restraining the merely human as not conducive to the fulfilment of his future mission.

In this way, he "increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." He knew what was in man; for he had experienced it as he grew up. He was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin, because he felt the drawings of the flesh, but elected to follow the

teachings of the Spirit. In this way, also, he came to be "full of the Holy Ghost," as Luke expresses it, and he was then led by the Spirit into the wilderness for his forty days of temptation and trial.

This event seems to have been the final test of strength between the human and the divine; for the temptations all took the form of catering to human limitations or susceptibilities, or to what might look like the wisdom of expediency.

The human element in his personality naturally urged him to take one course, or rather was utilized to that end, while the divine element opposed not only any yielding to the weaknesses of the flesh but also all catering to what appeared to be allowable short-cuts to earthly success, doing so on the ground that they were neither right nor wise.

In this lay his temptation. He was free to choose either course. He could yield to human impulses, prompted by Satan, as a matter of expediency, or he could reject all of Satan's methods, even though they might seem to promise well, doing so consistently, because they involved features which savored of the selfish and also of the presumptuous. He deliberately chose, in a word, to do right regardless of consequences, and he thereupon began his journey to the cross.

He knew what he was doing; for, otherwise, he could not have referred to his coming martyrdom, as he did more or less clearly, on at least twenty-five different occasions, which were scattered all the way along the course of his ministry. He saw it all. He faced it all.

He did not yield a hair. He did not sin. He came off conqueror. The Devil left him. The die was cast. He had made his choice. He had accepted God's will as his own. Henceforth he was to be completely dominated by that will. He had thus really become the Christ, since he had fulfilled the necessary conditions.

It was now possible for God to manifest himself in very truth in Jesus, because of this fact that the necessary conditions had been fulfilled. There had been no forced domination. Jesus had not surrendered his own will. He had elected to be the divine self and not the human self in whatsoever he did.

It was therefore practicable for God to take complete possession of him without at the same time violating any of the psychological laws which He had himself established in the realm of human relationships. Jesus and the Father could thus become one; for the divine part of his nature, representing the paternal element and replacing that element as it appears in other men, was now supreme. He was in very truth God manifest in the flesh.

No such outcome was possible on any other basis; for no mere human being could furnish the necessary foundation for such a manifestation. In other words, no human being of the ordinary sort could by any conceivable means become God manifest in the flesh. The thing is simply a psychological impossibility.

Complete domination there might be in a sense; but it would be the complete domination of a Savonarola or a Luther or a Calvin or a Wyclif or a Moody or a Gipsy Smith or a Jerry McAuley and never that of a Jesus

Christ. The two dominations are necessarily different in their very essence, and no way of escape from that conclusion can possibly be found.

In one there is a nature that is human throughout, even if it has been subjected to the influence of the Holy Spirit, and human throughout it will remain. Such a nature must be limited by all the frailties that flesh is heir to, or it has ceased to be human and a free moral agent.

In the other, a new nature, complex beyond that of a mere man, is in evidence from the very start. It contains a human element so combined with a divine one, as the New Testament distinctly indicates, that it is fitted, in advance, for a new kind of divine domination, which would ultimately so overshadow the human element as almost to eliminate it, without, however, doing violence to that element as a psychological entity.

The human element would remain, and it would not be violated in any particular. It would rather be so outweighed by the divine as to be practically lost sight of in the end, being essentially negligible because of its inferiority. Men would not perceive this at the start. They would see only the human. They would marvel, however, until they came to realize the truth. Then they would understand.

Growth and development must be allowed for, since the Christ could not fail to experience this human limitation as well as all the rest; but this growth and development would constantly tend to a more and more complete realization of the inherent divinity that was his and to a gradual elimination of the purely human.

The agony in the garden and the despairing cry on the cross may be taken as the last expiring struggles of this purely human element; for the purely divine could not suffer death, and the Holy Spirit's presence was therefore withdrawn from him that he might suffer in his human capacity and so taste of death for every man.

He could then do so without violating his divinity, and he could thus obtain a clear vision of what it means to mortals when they face death apart from God. He had no load of sin; but it was necessary for him to understand what such a load would be like to a man passing through the valley of the shadow to face his Creator and his Judge.

The mission of that element in him which was purely human would thus be fulfilled, and that element could accordingly be put aside after he had uttered his great and awful cry, as he hung on the cross and gave up the ghost: "Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani?" and "Father into thy hands I commend my spirit — it is finished."

So, indeed, it was. The merely human had ceased to be, though this must not be pressed too far. He had suffered in his human capacity and paid the penalty of death — for men. He had to do that as a man, divorced as far as possible from the divine nature. He did so, and then all human limitations passed away, never to return. The human experiences and characteristics still remained; but the divine was restored unto its own, and the merely human, as such, ceased to be, because its mission had been fulfilled.

The divine was thus enabled to reassume all its glory, and the Christ now revealed was to manifest his deity to

a sinful and rebellious world. It is a mystery which we cannot fathom; for the finite can neither measure nor comprehend the infinite. If we could understand it all, either God would cease to be God or we should cease to be human. We cannot compass the divine and still continue to be God's creatures. That much, at least, is clear.

Moreover, we are enveloped in mystery. The most familiar thing in our daily experience, our own eyesight, is a mystery wholly beyond our ken. We know what the eye does. We realize that a tiny photograph is produced upon the retina, that dead-white wall with its minute blood-vessels spreading out from the center; but how that image is transmitted to the brain and there transfused into the thing which we call sight is entirely beyond the powers of the wisest savant to explain.

It is done — somehow. We all know that — from experience. In like manner, the food that we eat is used to build hair on the head, nails on the fingers and toes, and skin on the surface of the body, to say nothing of all the organs and complexities within us, with never a mistake save in diseased conditions. How is it done? No man can answer.

We know that it is done and done in a marvelous way; for every human being is a witness to the fact, and we cannot escape it. We can only admit it and wonder. What folly it must be, then, for us to refuse to admit these other mysteries which have to do with God's plan of salvation for an erring world. He made us. He would save us. We rebel. We refuse to believe. We

set up our puny wills against His. And we pit our human wisdom against His omniscience! We actually think that we know better than He does.

Then He forsakes us and we suffer. We richly deserve to suffer. The fault is our own. Bunyan pictured the situation clearly in his "Holy War." "Lord Will-be-will" is mayor in the "town of Man-soul," and he does not propose to submit to any dictation. He must have his own way and he wants to keep on good terms with Diabolus.

Those who fall in with God's plan and accept Jesus as their Messiah soon discover that they have just begun to live. They have merely existed before, and have not known the real meaning of life. Now they know. They supposed that the change would involve the loss of all that life in this world meant; but, to their utter amazement, in losing their lives they have saved them.

Others who will not accept Him because they are determined to get all that they can out of life — in other words, are bound to save their lives — soon find that pleasure never satisfies the soul and that they have lost the power of enjoyment. They have really lost their lives in the very act of trying to save them. No other outcome is possible, right, or wise.

The whole thing is a paradox; but so is all life, and the sooner we face the fact the better for the world. We did not merely happen. We are not the result of pure chance. "Back of it all, somewhere, there is an inscrutable intelligence," as — a fact already stated in Chapter VI. — a great physicist and unbeliever once admitted;

and with that intelligence we must all ultimately reckon. There is no possible way of escape. What, then, ought we to do?

Shall we decide that Jesus was merely a man like ourselves, but a man of unusual presence and power? Suppose we do that. How shall we explain his life? What can we do with his character? What shall we think of his works? Shall we deny them? But if we do deny them, how are we to account for the fact that the Jews never attempted anything of the sort but sought to account for them on the theory that he used Egyptian magic? Did he do that?

Finally, what possible means can we discover with which to discount the testimony of the untold thousands who have accepted him as their Savior and found peace in doing so? Is it rational to attempt to relegate to the rubbish heap the common experience of both men and women in this matter during more than eighteen centuries?

To ignore such a weight of testimony as this — all the witnesses agree on the essential points to which they testify, and no man can number them — is to be unscientific. The witnesses can be found anywhere, at any time, in almost any part of the world. Are they all the victims of a great delusion?

Possibly you seek to escape by assuming that God made use of a man, even if he was conceived in sin, by so completely dominating him as to accomplish the task in that way.

Suppose He tried it. Would He have a man or a manikin, a rational being or a puppet worked with strings,

a Savior or a machine? Could a man be so dominated, if merely human, and continue to be a man? What will become of his free-will?

If you postulate a complete self-surrender, why has such a surrender always, without exception, come short, or failed to work the miracle, in every mortal man who has ever tried it? Can you deny the fact? There is but one Jesus, and there can be but one, although there have been many complete self-surrenders, some of them even in our own day.

Can such a theory be made to work? Is it a psychological possibility to obtain the requisite amount of the divine presence and power in a Messianic Jesus through any conceivable complete self-surrender, if that surrender is made by a being wholly human, unless the divine being also so overwhelms and overpowers the human one as to force it to become something other than a man who is a free moral agent.

Should an overwhelming and overpowering of that sort take place, what has become of the humanity of the subject? Can he be thus made something more than human, not in the sense that Jesus actually was, without at the same time becoming something less than human, in the sense that his own freedom as an intelligent being has been seriously curtailed if not completely destroyed?

It is not easy to escape this dilemma, except on the Biblical basis, which excludes it. On that basis the will of Jesus was absolutely free from the beginning to the end. His complete surrender only served to emphasize a nature that was already his in part, without in the least affecting

his humanity as such. That still remained; but every addition to the presence of the Spirit served to intensify that other part of his nature which was divine. No violence whatever was done to his humanity, and none was done to his freedom. All that contingency was precluded by the conditions precedent.

Now, postulate the utmost possible presence of the Spirit in the soul of a man without involving any such violation of his freedom of will and see what you get. You will have a saint, but never a Savior; for the requisite amount of domination becomes utterly impossible in a personality that is merely human, unless the human is partially destroyed in the process.

The experience and testimony of the ages should suffice to make this point clear and explicit. St. Augustine was thoroughly consecrated, and so was Thomas à Kempis; but by no possible stretch of the imagination can either be conceived of as a Jesus. Neither was without sin, and neither could be without sin. No nature purely human can attain to that distinction. Nothing short of a personality involving divinity can meet all the temptations of this world and come off conqueror.

Where, then, did this idea of such a being come from? And where did the idea of such a virgin birth originate? There is nothing like it in heathen literature; for the "virgin births" of heathen documents are not virgin, in reality, since carnal intercourse is never absent. A god or hero, in each instance, takes the place of a mortal father, and that furnishes the excuse for calling the birth a virgin one.

Even in the Zend-Avesta, which comes the nearest to the Christian concept, the mother of the last Saoshyant, the Persian Savior who was finally to appear and be born of a virgin, was to conceive through the seed of Zarathustra while bathing in Lake Kâsava where the seed had been placed after its preservation by the angel Nêryôsang. This "holy maid Eredat-fedhri" is thus exalted above ordinary mothers — she was supposed to be born about 3000 years after Zarathustra. — by being given this remarkable son who was to bring eternal light and life to mankind. Such was the teaching of the Magi.

It may possibly account for the visit of the wise men to Bethlehem; but the narrative cannot be compared to the story of the nativity as it appears in the New Testament. The idea of a conception by the Holy Ghost, or by direct divine agency, with no carnal element involved, is unmatched in the history of human thought. It has no counterpart in any literature; for the assumed parallels are not parallels in any true sense.

The Japanese legend that Nichirim was conceived because his mother dreamed of seeing the sun on a lotus blossom hardly counts: it is too patently a fairy tale. Jerome's legends about Gautama and Plato are not pertinent, for their origin is only too evident. Krishna, the son of Vasudeva and Devaki, is valueless in this connection, as is Gautama the son of Suddhodana, a rāja in Kapilavastu. His true history is too well authenticated.

He and Plato are alike in one thing — each is now known by an appellation, his original name having been forgotten. Plato means "broad-shouldered." His name

was Aristocles. Gautama became the "enlightened," and he is so known as Buddha.

In Buddhism that is unquestionably late, he is credited with being omniscient, absolutely sinless, and divine. He is said to have descended of his own accord from heaven, to have entered his mother's womb, to have had no earthly father, to have been attended by angels at his birth, and then to have walked three paces and proclaimed in a voice of thunder his own greatness. As this is patently an effort to outdo the gospel narrative, it is of no consequence.

Where, then, did the gospel narrative come from? How could such a story be conceived by men, when men have always marveled at it and always tried to explain it away? Could a fiction of that type be promulgated by any possible means among people whose one aim was a life of righteousness? Can men be successful teachers of righteousness and "monumental liars" at the same time?

The personality of our Lord corresponds in every particular to the exalted estate that his birth story necessarily involves. He is indeed divine in every sense of the word. Flawless he has always been, even in the eyes of his foes; for, although some have tried to do it by text perversions and other unwarranted assumptions, no one has ever been able to convict him of sin or of an ordinary human fault. How can that be explained?

There can be but one answer. The New Testament story is true. Jesus was not a mere mortal like ourselves. He was a God-man, a man in whom God had replaced by

the Holy Spirit the ordinary paternal element, and, in that way, had made it possible to manifest himself in the flesh. This is comprehensible, even if we cannot fathom all of its meaning, and it is satisfying. It provides us with a Savior, and some of us recognize the fact.

What man would dare to say: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life"? What man could say it, if he dared, and escape derision? Finally, if you consider that Jesus was merely a sort of sublimated mortal, why do you not do the consistent thing and ridicule his claims?

Here is a personality before which the nations of the earth are dumb. Savages bow down and do him reverence. Cannibals become as children in his presence and forget their thirst for blood. Sinners weep and find redemption from their sins. The "down-and-out," with neither the will power nor the sense to begin anew, get a vision of the meaning and possibility of purity, such as they have never dreamed of, and, coming to the cross with all their guilt and hopelessness and helplessness, find salvation. Even the gutter drunkard, when he has once looked into the face of Jesus and truly accepted him, crawls up from the mud, remains sober, and becomes a decent citizen.

Would you call that "natural"? Can a mere man furnish the power to do a thing like that? No heathen would admit such a possibility. They marvel at the fact that Christ gives his followers the power to do right. They know what is right and — fail in the effort to do it. They do not quibble about it. They admit it freely. Have we less acumen than the heathen possess?

Education never has and never can save men from sin. It may serve to keep sin out of sight, but it cannot prevent it. Your purely ethical man gets along very well while the sea is smooth and the winds of temptation are not blowing fiercely; but put him where he thinks that he will not be observed, away from his familiar restraining influences, and then see what will happen. That is the thing that men refer to when they say, "Character is what a man is on his vacation."

It is, beyond a doubt, and the Christian man is the only one that has ever been known to be just the same all the time, regardless of his surroundings. He has the saving grace of Jesus the Christ, and that is what makes the difference.

Now consider this fact. While the Old Testament contains such expressions as "spirit of God" and "spirit of the Lord (Jehovah)," the phrase "Holy Spirit" or "Holy Ghost" is confined to the New. Where did it originate? Would forgers, interpolating something in Christian manuscripts, be likely to invent such a term as that? How could they conceive of such an idea to begin with?

Observe also that to an ancient Jew God was a being of such awful majesty that his name (Jehovah) must never be pronounced. That would be sacrilege. It was the custom to substitute Lord for it, and the Septuagint conformed to that custom, as did our own Authorized Version. The revisions have followed the Hebrew text; but the Jews even now conform to the old usage and refer to the word Jehovah as the tetragrammaton (JHVH or

YHWH). Now tell me what Jew or set of Jews had the audacity to invent such a story, as that of the nativity.

Do you still think that Jesus was only a man? Well, I am from Missouri and must be shown. Kindly explain to me why no other religious leader of any sort has ever been able to do what he is still doing every day in giving the weary rest and peace, in saving to the uttermost those who in sincerity and truth come unto God through him, in redeeming from sin and then keeping from sin all who sincerely trust in him, regardless of race and clime and time and place, and in restoring the spiritually dead to life. He does such things as these.

No amount of enthusiasm, even if it is coupled with any other worldly force that you may select, has ever accomplished such results, and men know it. Then, too, I wish to know why the followers of Jesus consider him their one possession, without which life itself becomes meaningless and a worthless bauble. Can you tell me? If the New Testament tells the truth, I can understand. If it does not and you are right, the whole thing is a hopeless puzzle.

To be sure, men have agreed with you all along. They have done worse than that. Despairing of finding any flaws in his character, the ancients assailed his birth and vilified his mother. They also sought to discredit him; for they claimed that he did his wonders with the help of Egyptian magic. That intimated that he was a mountebank.

Slander was their only weapon. They used it to the full, and modern Jews now repudiate that account of his

life. Compiled, apparently, from the Talmud, which contains several somewhat obscure but plainly scurrilous references to his birth and life, it has become too much even for them, because they recognize its injustice. They act accordingly.

They will not admit that he was the Messiah; but they do admit that he was a brother Jew and a prophet, a man exalted above his fellows. Conservatism and Christian theology prevent them from going further, because they cannot see how Messiah can be God. To them, God is too awful a being to be incarnate. As Christian theology teaches that Christ is God, they balk at going any further.

Over against their attitude must be placed another that is much less commendable. It belongs to some of the professed followers of Jesus. They deny his divinity quite as vigorously; but they do it in pulpits supposed to be orthodox. And they pervert his teachings. They misrepresent him. "Peace at any price" is foisted upon him, although he never by word or act countenanced any such doctrine. The keynote of his message and his life was this: "Righteousness at any cost." That is what he really preached, and he lived up to it.

That will explain everything that he ever said or ever did, not excepting such apparent opposites as the injunction to turn the other cheek and the forcible driving out of the animals from the court of the temple with a scourge.

When his own face was slapped — that is the meaning of the Greek — in the house of Annas, he did not turn the other cheek. He rebuked the offender, and he used

slang to do so. "Why did you skin me?" (τί με δέρεις; Jo. xviii. 23), is what he said, and English has "tan my hide" to match it.

If you are shocked, get over it. He fitted his words to the occasion and the man. He was neither inconsistent nor lacking in culture, but was, as usual, highly efficient. To turn the other cheek was to plead guilty to something of which he was innocent. It was not to meet personal animosity with "coals of fire." Circumstances alter cases. Remember that.

He forbade his disciples to call men "fools" (μωροί), and then did it himself; but he was not even then guilty of inconsistency; for the content of words is the thing that counts, not their form. Witness the oaths of sailors bestowed upon friend and foe alike with only a change of tone and expression.

When a Jew said, "Fool!" he was actuated by a spirit of murderous hate. That spirit was the thing that Jesus was aiming at, not the use of the word "fool." Paul enjoined the worldly wise to become fools (1 Cor. iii. 18), and said that the apostles were fools (*ibid.* iv. 10) for Christ's sake. What, then, did Jesus mean by the Sermon on the Mount?

Simply this. He was fighting the code of personal vengeance that was everywhere in evidence. He was not formulating a set of fixed rules for that or any other age. What he did was to express by precepts the spirit that he wished his followers to cultivate. He came to destroy set rules of conduct. They are necessary with children, but a failure with all others.

They lead to evasion and hypocrisy. They also lead to cant, and Christians who try to live on such a basis are likely to land in all three of the vices mentioned. The spirit of love alone can save men from such an outcome, and those who are dominated by that spirit are following him.

One other limitation needs to be mentioned. Human motives cannot be dealt with by law. That is clear, since the concrete act alone can be made the subject of legislation. No other course is possible in the very nature of things. Acts, however, always depend on motives, and Jesus goes to the very root of the matter and deals with them. They are the things that make the law necessary; for there is no genuine breach of the law, just as there can be no real sin, without wrong or questionable motives and intentions.

His precepts were therefore aimed at wrong motives, and he approached the subject from the angle that he did because nothing else either then or now can be so easily understood by the common people.

He condemned wrong motives and struck at them through the everyday acts of his hearers. Christian etiquette and good form were not the things thus taught. The shaft goes much deeper than that, even to the thoughts and intents of the heart.

Jesus never contemplated fostering criminality. Many of his pacifist followers, however, in their zeal for present security, would do just that and, in some cases, actually are doing it. They have done their part in producing our youthful bandits; but, fortunately, they are not yet

exhibiting their faith by clamoring for the disbanding of the police in our great cities.

Jesus would not even countenance an outward observance of the law, such as some of our pacifist brethren are really preaching, and that, in itself, was enough to make the Jews hate him, since that is what they practiced.

He did not spare them, and he made no effort whatever to conciliate them. He might have told the man with the withered hand to come around the next day and be healed; but, instead of that, he openly defied the whole synagogue, challenged their entire position, and healed the man then and there on the Sabbath.

He did it for the sake of righteousness and to teach them the true spirit of the Mosaic dispensation. They did not care to learn, being too self-satisfied, and they ended by hating him with such intensity that nothing short of his death would satisfy them.

He had no delusions in respect to the matter. He knew what was involved. He faced death on the cross from the very beginning, and he was fully aware of that fact. This is made clear by his references to it, as already mentioned, on some twenty-five different occasions.

He did not flinch, however, and he did not hesitate to arouse bitter opposition on the part of those who were at fault in their interpretation of the Jewish Scriptures.

His most relentless foes were therefore the most highly respected members of the community; for they were the men who occupied places of influence in the synagogue as the accredited orthodox religious leaders. He fought them to a finish and then paid for it with his life.

How can you fit "peace at any price" into such a course as that? If he believed in any such doctrine, why did he not occasionally practice it? He never did, as any one must see who looks below the surface of things. He did fulfill the law, as he said that he came to do; but he did not do it in the way that his opponents insisted upon, since he ignored the letter and kept the spirit by practicing righteousness. That was the thing that Moses aimed at; but they failed to see it. Israel was a child in Moses's day, and rules had to be used in consequence.

They could not be avoided then, and they cannot be avoided now, in dealing with wrongdoers; but the rules themselves are never the important thing, they are not the object aimed at in their formulation—it is always something that lies behind the rules, which men seek to attain by means of the rules, whatever the form of legislation may happen to be. Men forget that fact and therefore unduly exalt the law itself, instead of properly exalting its object. They also forget that "The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life."

The legalist is always with us, and he is usually very much in evidence. Moreover, the struggle between true Christianity and a sort of Christian legality has continued down through the ages even from Saint Paul's day. The Judaizers were legalists. They expected to obtain salvation through forms and ceremonies.

Christianity denies the effectiveness of all such things and demands purity of heart and a spirit of love as a necessity in all disciples. Such a spirit is what Jesus aimed at when he said, "Resist not evil."

He did not intend us to suppose that evil men were to be allowed to do as they please with us or with our belongings. He did mean, conquer such by love *as far as that is possible*.

If he had meant the other thing, his kingdom would have been doomed before it was even founded, since Satan would have been given free rein to work his will. We are not to use his methods and meet hate with hate in personal affairs, and we are not to overcome others by sheer force of will. That is the Devil's way, and we should shun it.

Jesus exalted meekness; but he was no weakling. He was the most manly man that ever lived. Manly men are always meek men; for they are polite and courteous, especially to the aged and infirm.

Without meekness men become bullies. Without it they tend to criminality. For lack of it they resort to scandalous practices in war, disregard the principles of justice, know no law save that of their own interest, do not hesitate to murder helpless women and children, make use of hellish inventions to torture or affright their foes, and then look upon themselves as the elect of God.

That is not Christian. It is the very essence of heathenism. Jesus was right. He did not teach a doctrine of submission fit only for slaves, — to say so is to misunderstand and slander him, — but a doctrine that is absolutely necessary if men are to live together in peace and harmony.

Such a doctrine, however, can make of any man a hero if he only wills to have it so; for it enables men to stand

fast for righteousness anywhere and everywhere, and then, if need be, pay the price for doing as their Master would have them do. That requires courage of a high order. No weakling can do it under any circumstances. It takes a man.

Jesus himself did exactly that, and in doing it showed us the way. When our turn comes, he alone can help us to endure and not succumb to the temptation to dodge the issue and compromise the matter for the sake of peace. Men do just that and then flatter themselves that it is Christian. It is not. It is essentially heathenish. The motive back of the act is pure selfishness, and that never was and never can be Christian.

Men seem to think that "safety first" is what Jesus came to teach. On the contrary, his message is: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness." He said that in his sermon (Mt. vi. 33).

That may lead to something very unlike peace; for it has so led in the case of every martyr who ever bore witness to the Messiah with his blood. Incidentally, however, such a course will lead to the only sort of safety that is really worth having — the safety of the spirit that comes with salvation.

Man's duty, therefore, is clear. He should put righteousness first. Then and not till then may he claim the rest that has been promised him. Did you never think of that? Jesus said: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." You cannot do that without forsaking sin. It is a clarion call, — "Hither! all ye that labor," — and men have

heard it and obeyed in every part of the world. They have not acted in vain.

Imagine a *man* saying that to you or to me! Would it not sound like the height of absurdity? Jesus said it, and Jesus has never failed to make good, when men have taken him at his word. How do you explain that if he was only a man? Could he give "absent treatment" to last through the ages?

That he was nothing more than a mortal like ourselves, though used by God for a special purpose, is simply unthinkable. He was a God-man, God manifest in the flesh as the New Testament teaches, God revealing himself in a lesser understandable personality to men, a bit of the Godhead born into a human body as the Son of God for our salvation, and on no other basis is it possible to find a rational explanation of his life and work.

Paul understood this perfectly. Consider Philippians ii. 5-8, the literal meaning of which is, "Be minded in yourselves *with* that *mind* which *was* also in Christ Jesus, who, beginning (ὑπάρχων) in a form of God, did not regard (ἡγήσατο) the being equal (εἶναι ἴσα) to God *as* a matter-of-robbery; but he emptied himself, taking a form of a bondservant (a mere man), becoming (being born) in a likeness of men; and having been found in appearance as a man, he abased himself, becoming obedient unto death, moreover (δὲ), of a cross!" Lower he could not go: he had abased himself to the limit.

Just beyond, in verse 11, he says that every tongue shall confess "that Lord *is* Jesus Christ." The Greek has but three words in the order given, after the introductory

“that,” as indicated. It seems to mean that Jesus Christ stands for Jehovah manifest in human form; for Lord is not the subject and is, therefore, decidedly emphatic. The word itself is the one used in the Septuagint to translate Jahveh (Yahweh). Jesus was no mere man. Paul so recognized, and he so affirms.

CHAPTER X.

CHRIST'S ESTIMATE OF HIMSELF.

A NEWCOMER in any place is expected to tell who and what he is. Men listen to his account of himself and give it full credence, unless there is something about it that savors of exaggeration or of deceit. When that sort of thing is present, they withhold their opinion until the matter can be looked into in some way or further testimony is available.

Christ was evidently different from ordinary men, and the natural thing for us to do is to enquire what he had to say about himself. He was a newcomer, in a sense, in this world of ours, and he could fairly be asked to explain who and what he was and what his business was among the sons of men. It is therefore pertinent to ask whether he gave any definite account of himself when on earth.

That he did, no one questions. His testimony began when he was but a lad of twelve years; for when Joseph and Mary missed him and returned to Jerusalem, they found him in the temple communing with the doctors of the law, and he expressed surprise that they did not know where to look for him — “*Why was it that you searched-after me? Didn't you know that it behooved me to be in my Father's house?*”

While the word “house” is lacking in the Greek, it is plainly understood, and, according to the testimony of a learned woman who claimed a residence of thirty years

in Palestine, there is a tradition in Jerusalem to this day to the effect that the doctors then present were angered by his supposed blasphemy, and that one of them would have struck him had not Mary stepped between and said: "He is not yet of legal age, strike me." Nevertheless, they never forgot or forgave him for making such a remark. It is Luke, the educated Gentile, who relates the incident (ii. 49).

Observe that the only word that can be supplied without making the tradition pointless is something that refers to the temple. The article used is in the plural, and the Greek word commonly employed to designate a house of any pretensions is likewise in the plural οἰκία. The other word (οἶκος) is a general term, meaning any sort of a place to live in, even a room. It could be and was used of the temple; but the more dignified word was οἰκία, and that was the word understood. It could sometimes be rendered "buildings."

He thus implied directly, when only twelve years of age, that God was his Father, and his words were regarded as blasphemous by his hearers. It is useless to sneer at the tradition; for it fits into Jewish ideas, and it accords with Jewish mental processes with precision. Moreover, oriental traditions are deserving of a wholesome respect. If any one is disposed to deny that, he merely indicates how little he knows of the oriental.

The oriental's ways are not our ways, his memory is not our feeble faculty, his psychology is not our psychology, and what scholars need above all other things, oftentimes, is to rub elbows with some Semite or Hindu

or Japanese or Chinaman long enough to catch his inner self revealing itself to him with frankness because of a sympathetic responsiveness on his part toward the oriental point of view. Instead of that, we occidentals regard ourselves as "it," and imagine that all orientals must meet us on our own stamping ground or else be regarded as of no account! Nothing could be more short-sighted or more calculated to blind one's eyes to the truth.

Nothing more is said of Christ's claims until his temptation in the wilderness. The basis of two of those temptations is significant. It is the remark, "If thou art the Son of God." Observe that those words have no point whatever, unless he had either made a claim of that sort himself or had accepted some one else's statement to that effect.

If he did not so consider himself, the Devil was guilty of an egregious blunder in prefacing his solicitations in any such way; but if he had fully accepted that estimate of himself, the Devil was extremely clever in using it as he did. The Synoptics tell the story. John omits it.

When Nathaniel said to him, only a little later, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God," Jesus not only did not deny it, but promised him more convincing evidence of his belief (Jo. i. 50-51). In effect he admitted that Nathaniel was right and then promised to make the fact still more evident. If he incidentally called himself the Son of man, he merely followed his usual practice of exalting his humanity for the sake of a closer fellowship with mankind.

At the marriage in Cana, he protested to his mother that it was not yet time to disclose his identity; but he wrought the miracle for all that and made the water into wine. If he used a more rapid process than the one he placed in nature, who are we that we should question his ability to do so?

When he cleansed the temple, he spoke of it as the house of his Father, and there was no possibility of misunderstanding him, *μὴ ποιεῖτε τὸν οἶκον τοῦ πατρὸς μου οἶκον ἐμπορίου*. He used the general word for house this time, because it was the appropriate one to employ in the contrast he expressed. The temple was not to be turned into a market place, an emporium.

Shortly afterward, in talking to Nicodemus, he claimed to have descended from heaven (Jo. iii. 13), and added that he must be lifted up even as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, "that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." The revisions leave out the idea of perishing; but even so, if he was a mere man, he must have had a monumental modesty to say such a thing as that! If a man were to say it now, he would be adjudged insane and shut up in an asylum. Was Christ insane?

When talking with the woman of Samaria, on his way back to Galilee, he definitely stated that he was the Messiah (Jo. iv. 26); but the Greek implies more than the English does by the words, "I that speak unto thee am *he*." It reads, *Ἐγὼ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι*, and the "I am" suggests the great I AM of Exodus iii. 14. Moses was to tell the children of Israel that "I AM hath sent me

unto you," and whenever Christ used the expression ἐγώ εἰμι in such a connection, he may have suggested, if he did not imply, Jehovah. There is no "he." All he said was, "I am, the-one talking-with thee."

That he had a right to thus imply Jehovah was made manifest when he told the paralytic borne of four that his sins were forgiven him and then proved that he spoke no idle words by healing him of his disease on the spot.

It was an easy thing to say, "Thy sins are forgiven," because no one could prove that they were not; but to say "Arise and walk" was another matter, since every one present could put that to the test of his own eyesight.

When the man got up, took up his bed, and departed, the proof was beyond any possibility of contradiction, unless the whole thing was a piece of rank imposture. That it was not, the entire setting plainly implies. If it had been a concocted incident, the roof would probably have been spared, because the owner's hostility would have been taken into consideration by the conspirators and a chance to enter would have been demanded.

Many will doubtless object to the statement that the expression, ἐγώ εἰμι, suggests Jehovah; but they must bear in mind that their matter-of-fact stolid Anglo-Saxon intellect is not of the Semitic type. Moreover, metaphor is foreign to the genius of the English language, while it is the very essence of many an oriental tongue. Scholars sometimes forget that when such matters as this are under discussion. The mystic understands.

When the infirm man at the Pool of Bethesda was healed, the Jews began to persecute Jesus because it was

done on the Sabbath day; but his answer was, "my Father worketh hitherto, and I work." That incensed the Jews still more, and they "sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the Sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." (Jo. v. 18.)

He then told them that he could do nothing of himself, but did what he saw the Father doing, that the Father showed him all that He was doing, and that He would show him greater works that they might marvel.

He added that the Father raised the dead and quickened them, that the Son also quickened whom he would, that the Son was to be honored of all "even as they honor the Father," that those who do not honor the son do not honor the Father, that those who hear his word and believe Him that sent him have eternal life, and that the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God and live.

He went on to say that "as the Father hath life in himself; so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself": and that the Father "hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man."

Here, almost in the same breath, he called himself both the Son of God and the Son of man, and in each case the term used was appropriate. He thus recognized his dual nature and what it meant, and the fact that he used both terms together destroys whatever argument may be drawn from his use of the second as an evidence of a human fatherhood. The truth of the matter is that his use of that term was really an evidence of his divinity.

It was his divinity that made him exalt his humanity and refer to it so constantly.

But there is more to be said on the topic under discussion; for he stated further that those in their graves were to hear his voice and arise to judgment, that his works showed that the Father had sent him, that the Scriptures testified of him, that Moses wrote of him, and that if they had believed Moses they would have believed him.

These claims are definite enough, and among them appear words that can only mean that his miracles were genuine; for the statement that his works showed that he came from the Father is pointless, unless it means that he wrought real miracles as an evidence of his mission and his Godhead.

Those who would discard miracles are therefore in direct conflict with his testimony, and they seek to destroy evidence to which he himself appealed. No Jew ever tried to deny that evidence. It was too public. What the Jews did was to try to explain it away on the ground that he used Egyptian magic.

When he preached the Sermon on the Mount, he set up his authority against that of Moses and the elders (Mt. v. 21-48), having previously claimed to be lord of the Sabbath and greater than the temple (xii. 6, 8; Mk. ii. 28), and he spoke with the utmost confidence. He did not teach "peace at any price," as some would have us believe, but "righteousness at any cost." That is a different proposition. His gospel was not a gospel for slaves, but for men and for heroes, as already suggested.

Incidentally, it may be said that his "pluck it out, and cast *it* from thee" and his "cut it off, and cast *it* from thee" have never been taken with exact literalness, and they were not meant to be so taken. That form of statement was merely an emphatic way of saying "have done with them absolutely," and the idea that it is better for one member to perish than for all to go to perdition simply carries out the figure and drives the lesson home.

Our modern English slang expression, "cut it out," is somewhat similar. The genius of the language is a vital element in all such matters, and the content of the words is of far greater importance than their form. Men often forget that completely, and they run into many an error in consequence. Hyperbole is perfectly legitimate in eastern tongues. It is frowned on in English, or condemned.

When John the Baptist sent to know if Jesus was the Messiah, Jesus himself told the messengers to report what they had seen — "The blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached unto them." (Mt. xi. 5; Lu. vii. 22.)

Here is further testimony from his own lips as to the reality of his miracles. If he did not tell the truth, he must have done some most extraordinary lying as well as practiced some unbelievable humbuggery for their benefit. Is that sort of a solution rational? If it is not, the miracles must stand.

In the house of Simon the Pharisee, he again forgave sins and bade the woman go in peace (Lu. vii. 48-50),

and they asked themselves, "Who is this that even forgiveth sins?" (R.V., the better rendering.)

On one of the twenty-five different occasions when he referred to his coming death, he stated that he would remain in the "heart of the earth" three days and three nights (Mt. xii. 40), even as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale, thus implying his resurrection, very much as he did at the beginning of his ministry when he said, "Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up."

Incidentally, let it be said that this statement necessarily implies that the early belief of the Church in a crucifixion on Thursday, not on Friday, was correct, and that there was no eventless day in Passion Week. The problem is a most difficult one; but Thursday offers less complications than Friday, it involves no contradiction of the above words, and it therefore appears to have been the actual day of his death.

Even in his parables Christ either makes extraordinary claims for himself or speaks with amazing authority. Thus, he states that he sows good seed in the world, while the Devil sows tares (Mt. xiii. 37-39), that the harvest is the end of the world (or age), that the reapers are the angels, and that he will send out the angels to separate the tares from the wheat and dispose of them.

For a mere man to make such a statement would seem to involve a presumption that only the insane are capable of. But the record says that he made it! He could hardly have done so unless he believed that he was the Son of God.

When the Gadarene demoniac so addressed him, he did not deny that he was. Instead of that he rebuked the devils and cast them out, and he then told the man that had been possessed, to tell what God had done for him, thus implying that God had worked through, or in, himself for the healing.

Moreover, he even went so far as to commission the twelve to work miracles (Mt. x. 8), and he promised them divine help in their coming troubles (*Ibid.* 19-20), which he foretold in detail for their benefit.

Matthew, Mark, and John all bear witness that he walked on the sea, and all of them state that he said, "It is I; be not afraid." His actual words were, "I am; be not afraid," Ἐγώ εἰμι, μὴ φοβεῖσθε. An inflected tongue could not mix up "person" in such a sentence, as the English does, and that must be remembered; but the phrase suggests the I AM for all that, even if Peter did say, "If thou art (εἰ σὺ εἶ), bid me come unto thee upon the waters."

When they had crossed the sea, the multitude did the same thing on the next day, and he intimated to them that they were after more loaves and fishes. He then told them to seek for meat that would abide unto eternal life, saying that the Son of man would furnish it; "for him hath God the Father sealed." To their inquiry as to how they could work the works of God, he said: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." (Jo. vi. 29.)

Asking for evidence that they might believe on him, they led him to say that he was the bread of life, and that

those who came unto him should never hunger. He ended by saying that he came down from heaven, that it was God's will that those who believed on him should have eternal life, and that he would raise up such at the last day.

That set them to murmuring, and he went on to say that no one could come to him unless God drew him, that he was the only man that had ever seen God, that those who believe have eternal life, and that he is the living bread from heaven that enables a man to live forever. Their doubts only made him reiterate his statements, and they decided that it was a "hard saying."

It certainly was a hard saying, if he was no more than a man. Nay, it was an insane statement for one who was no more than a man to make, and we must either conclude that he really was the Son of God or else that he was an insane idealist and therefore irresponsible. As he has always made good when put to the test by men of every age, it can hardly be assumed that he was either insane or irresponsible. But, on that basis, he was more than a man.

The time finally came when he asked the twelve who men said that he was. When that question had been answered, he asked: "But who say ye that I am?" Peter replied: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Observe that Matthew is the only one who gives this answer in full (Mt. xvi. 16), but that Mark and Luke are in substantial agreement. Did he rebuke Peter? Instead, he said that his Father in heaven had revealed it unto him.

Then he gave Peter his name, — Peter, a stone, πέτρος, — and added that on this truth which Peter had uttered — he called it a rock, πέτρα — he would build his Church.

Observe that this interpretation of the passage will stand the test of any critical examination. The name given Peter is masculine, as it should be, while the other word is feminine. There is therefore no excuse for using the other word, unless it refers to something different from that which the first word implies, the general meaning of the two being similar.

Observe further that a careful search through all the citations from Greek literature has failed to reveal a single passage in the Greek tongue in which πέτρος means anything but a detached, movable stone, or where πέτρα means anything but some part or formation of the earth's rocky crust, which is the foundation of everything mundane. The two words, then, cannot have the same meaning, and the second must refer to Peter's confession.

It means "bedrock" in some of its various manifestations — a ledge, a crag, the walls of a cave, etc. Even where it seems to mean a stone it does not; for the giants in Homer and Hesiod tear up masses of living rock, not pick up stones, to throw. They rip up a ledge, so to speak, and hurl the pieces, so that πέτραι cannot be taken to mean "stones" even in those passages, or in the works of any other good author. It means "portions of the earth's rocky crust."

Here, then, is a stupendous claim. The Church is based on the doctrine formulated by Peter, according to which Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God,

and it was to be built thereon according to Christ's own testimony. Lamenting Peter's words, "For other foundation hath no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (1 Cor. iii. 11.)

It says, therefore, that Jesus was the Son of God, and we know that he was a man like ourselves. Is he subordinate of the Church itself? Is he denying the very foundation upon which it was built? In plain English this means that the man who does that sort of thing cannot be a Christian in any real sense of the word. He may be a compromiser, but he is not a member in the army of Jesus Christ. He cannot be in the nature of things, because he is opposed to Christ himself. That should be a sobering thought, but we must go on.

Shortly after the event last described, he said: "The Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected of the Jews and chief priests and scribes, and be slain, and be raised the third day." Luke is the only one who gives the exact words. He, too, but Matthew and Mark give identical testimony in the form of indirect, instead of direct, quotation, and they repeat his promise to come "in the glory of his Father with his angels" to "render unto every man according to his deed."

That he repeated this statement concerning his coming passion is illustrated by the same three evangelists. Mt. xvi. 21-22; Mark ix. 31; Luke ix. 44; but it appears that none of them understood what he meant even if his words did fill them with sadness.

At the Feast of Tabernacles he said (Jo. vii. 26) "My doctrine teaching is not mine, but his that sent me."

and here as in xiv. 24, as was indicated in Chapter IV., it may have been "man's" instead of "mine." He added that if any one willed to do God's will he should "know of the doctrine, whether it be of God, or *whether* I speak of myself." The Greek uses two different prepositions here, the first (*ἐκ*) indicating that God was the source of the teaching, and the second (*ἀπὸ*) that, if He was not, it came forth "from" Jesus himself and therefore appeared to have had a human origin. The point is that it had no such origin and was not the result of human initiative.

Then he began to tell them that he was going back to Him who sent him and that they could not come there.

On the last day of the feast, he bade those that thirsted to come to him, citing a promise of the Scriptures to the effect that those who believed should have living waters within themselves.

The next time he spoke, he claimed to be the light of the world, and in the discussion which followed he said that if they knew him they would know the Father also. He added that he was from above and not of this world, contrasting himself with them. He ended by saying: "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am *he*, and *that* I do nothing of myself, but as my Father hath taught me, I speak these things." Observe that the Greek has no "he" and that it also has the usual suggestiveness as well as the usual limitations — unless it is *ἐγώ εἰμι*, I AM.

His next words were directed to those who had believed on him, and he soon stated that if the Son should make them free they should be free indeed. Disturbed by his

next remarks, they soon offered him the insult mentioned above in Chapter iv., and he answered them: "If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I proceeded forth and came from God; neither came I of myself, but he sent me." (Jo. viii. 42.) He added that the Devil was their father and a murderer.

Then he challenged them by saying: "Which of you convicteth me of sin?" (R.V., the better rendering.) Soon after that he said: "If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death," or (as the Greek has it) "shall not see death forever." Provoked by this assertion, they demand to know if he is greater than Abraham, and his reply indicates that he is; for it contains the assertion, "Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw *it*, and was glad."

To their sneering remark that he was not yet fifty years old, he solemnly averred, "Before Abraham was born [the Greek reading], I am." The formula has no doubtful meaning in this case, and, understanding it fully, they took up stones to stone him. He had intimated that he was the I AM.

When he sent out the seventy, during the Perean ministry, he told them (Lu. x. 16) that any one who despised (rejected) him despised (rejected) Him that sent him, meaning, unquestionably, God himself. And at about the same time he said: "All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no man knoweth the Son, but the Father; neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and *he* to whomsoever the Son will reveal *him*." (Mt. xi. 27.) Luke (x. 22) has "who the Son is" and

“who the Father is.” In each the Greek has “is willing to reveal.” No purpose is involved. That would require ἐθέλω. The word used is βούλομαι. The revisers have therefore over-translated the word, making it arbitrary.

After he had healed the man born blind and the Pharisees had made much ado about it, because it was done on the Sabbath, Jesus heard that they had cast the man out and, finding him, said: “Dost thou believe on the Son of God?” He replied with a question as to who he was, and the answer came, “Thou hast both seen him, and it is he that talketh with thee.” Then the man worshiped him and he accepted the homage without question. The Greek word, προσκυνέω, means to “make obeisance to” gods or kings, to “fall down and worship.”

Then follows the parable of the good shepherd (Jo. x. 1-21), in which he claims to be just that himself, and to lay down his life for the sheep voluntarily. “I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again,” is what he said, and no mere man could possibly say such a thing truthfully. But he said more than that; for when they asked him to state plainly whether he was the Christ, he answered: “I told you, and ye believed not; the works that I do in my Father’s name, they bear witness of me.” (Jo. x. 24-25.)

That was tantamount to a declaration that he was the Christ and that his miracles proved it. That is exactly what they were meant to do, and he only stated a fact. But when he went on to say that he gave his sheep eternal life, and to add, “I and *my* Father are one,” they took up stones to stone him for making himself

God. That is what he apparently did; for the Greek means, "The Father and I are a unit." They took it to mean "one thing," which is the usual content of *ἐν*. The English order should reverse, not follow, the Greek; for it is impolite to put another first in Greek, just as it is to put him second in English.

Parrying their charge of blasphemy with Ps. lxxxii. 6, "I have said, Ye *are* gods," he admitted that he had called himself a "Son of God" — there is no "the" in the Greek — and exhorted them to believe his works if they did not believe him, "that ye may know, and believe, that the Father *is* in me, and I in him." And they sought again to take him, but he escaped.

Here he once more refers to his miracles as an evidence of his divinity. And men would now throw out those same miracles as irrelevant!

Later, when he and the twelve were about to return to Jerusalem, he once more, according to the Synoptics, foretold his crucifixion, this time with more minuteness of detail, adding that he would rise again on the third day. (Mt. xx. 18-19; Mk. x. 33-34; Lu. xviii. 32-33.) But they did not yet understand, and they found it even harder to grasp the truth after the event itself. Does that indicate that the whole thing was a fake and the gospel story a lie?

At the beginning of Passion Week, he wept over Jerusalem and foretold its complete destruction, and it is useless to claim a late date for the story; for the prophecy was not entirely fulfilled until A.D. 135, when Hadrian demolished the towers of Herod as well as the rest of

the city. They had been spared by Titus. Note that a second century date is untenable.

On Tuesday he uttered these words, "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all *men* unto me." Doubting him, the people said: "We have heard out of the law that Christ abideth forever; and how sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?" Exhorting them to believe on the light while they had it, he departed from them. (Jo. xii. 32-36.)

Later in the day, he proclaimed that those who believe on him believe on Him that sent him — on God. And he claimed that the Father had given him a commandment as to what he was to say, and that he obeyed it. He also foretold the utter destruction of Jerusalem again, and Matthew and Mark, as well as Luke, record the fact. (Mt. xxiv. 2; Mk. xiii. 2; Lu. xxi. 6.)

Sitting on the Mount of Olives, he discoursed to them of the end of it all; but no one even now fully understands what he meant, although some seem to imagine that they are exceptions. That is much to be doubted. Are they inspired?

The words, "and then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven" (Mt. xxiv. 30), might as well be rendered "miracle of the Son," etc.; for the word used is the common one for miracle, and "sign" is comparatively colorless and therefore means little, when its ordinary translation is considered. It might be better, however, to use "sign" in all the passages; for men could not then dodge its true significance. All the miracles were signs of the divinity of Jesus. Remember that.

He is to come, so he said, with power and great glory, and his angels are to gather his elect from the four winds, or from everywhere. This would seem to imply the resurrection beyond a doubt; but he speedily added, "This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled."

It must therefore be concluded, as it ordinarily is, that he mixed up references to the destruction of Jerusalem and to the end of the present dispensation or else that he spoke in metaphors after the oriental fashion. Men pretend to understand all that he said on that occasion, and they explain things accordingly; but they are not really so wise, unless they have had a special revelation. There are some features of it that we cannot know now.

When next he spoke (Mt. xxv. 31-46) of coming with the angels in his glory, to judge all nations, it would appear that nothing but the resurrection could possibly have been meant; for the wicked are dismissed to suffer eternal punishment, while the righteous are rewarded with eternal life.

The only thing, however, that is really pertinent to the present discussion is the fact that he claims, in that connection, to be the judge who will preside when the nations are thus assembled for the final reckoning. No man could be such a judge or claim to do such a thing.

Again, at the institution of the Lord's Supper, he intimated that his blood was to atone for the sins of his followers — "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Mt.

xxvi. 28). This, also, is a statement that no man could truthfully make.

But soon after that he said: "I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me." And he went even further, saying, "he that hath seen me hath seen the Father." He also exhorted them, as he had others, to believe him "for the very works' sake." Nay, more, he promised that the believer should do works greater than his, because he went to his Father. By this he seems to have meant miracles of the spirit whereby those who are dead in sin are made alive again. (Jo. xiv. 6-12.)

In the metaphor of the vine, he claims to be the source of all righteousness, "without me ye can do nothing," and no man could possibly make such a claim as that. He would stultify himself if he did. But men are to bear fruit if they abide in him! Nothing could be more explicit, and no pledge would be more impossible for a man to carry out, if he were so presumptuous as to utter it.

But, not long after that, he promised, furthermore, to send "the Comforter" to them, and he assured them that "the Spirit of truth" should guide them into all truth, that the Spirit should glorify him, and that all things that the Father had were his. If he was merely an ordinary man, was not that a somewhat modest claim to make? God's partner in everything! Think of it.

But he went further. Listen to this: "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give *it* you." They were then told definitely to *ask in his name*. And

he promised them again that they should receive. He ended by saying that he was returning to the Father, and they began to understand him.

In the Intercessory Prayer, he went further yet, claiming to have had glory with the Father before the world was, as well as to be one, belief in whom, with God, constituted eternal life. And he prayed near the end that they might be a unit even as he and the Father were. For unit he used the same Greek word that he had employed in saying that he and the Father were one, and a spiritual oneness is implied.

When Caiaphas adjured him by the living God to say whether he was "the Christ, the Son of God," thus putting him under oath, he replied: "Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." (Mt. xxvi. 64.) In other words, he said, "Yes, I am; nevertheless," etc. Mark (xiv. 62) has "I am."

The revisions are better; but even they are inadequate. The real meaning] is, "From this moment (ἀπ' ἄρτι) ye *who are here present* shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand [plural to make it all-inclusive] of power and coming on the clouds of heaven." The high priest himself, then, was to see evidence of his Messiahship! He did — at the time of the crucifixion and on the Day of Pentecost.

His words were instantly pronounced blasphemous, and he was adjudged worthy of death. Nevertheless, he told the Sanhedrin that from that time (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) he was

to be seated at the right hand of the power of God. (Lu. xxii. 69.)

Asked if he was the Son of God, he replied in the affirmative, and they in like manner at once pronounced it blasphemy. The Greek is, 'Υμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι, and the ὅτι may mean "because" just as it may in his reply to Pilate (Jo. xviii. 37). English has the word Yes. Other languages, especially ancient ones, often lack it, and a circumlocution is therefore necessary.

Finally, on the cross, he promised the thief that he should be in Paradise with him that day. Moreover, he prefaced his promise with a word of asseveration. That made it practically equivalent to an oath.

In the light of these facts, — there is no denying them, — one must conclude either that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, or else that he was an insane idealist, possessed by an unbelievable megalomania which defies description, unless he was in fact a crazy mountebank and a monumental deceiver. Men have been insane enough to imagine that they were Jesus Christ; but was ever a man so mad that he believed himself to be God? Was Jesus such an one?

Is there the slightest evidence of a lack of sanity in any of his words or acts? Are they not all perfectly consistent and rational, so far as their form or effect can be traced? Was his character that of a lunatic or fraud?

But if that horn of the dilemma is so hopeless, is it rational to believe that he was merely a man? Nay, is it sane to affirm that he was only a man like ourselves and that he could have been nothing more?

Could a man like ourselves have made good after saying: "Come unto me all ye that labor, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest"? But — has he ever failed to do so in human experience?

What, then, is the meaning of his estimate of himself? Was he merely a man who did not understand himself or was self-deluded or was insane or crazed on religious subjects so that he imagined himself to be God? Was he a man whom "nobody knows," or was he a being serenely conscious of his own innate divinity and oneness with God? On one of the horns of this dilemma you must be impaled. Which do you prefer?

CHAPTER XI.

THE MEANING OF THE CROSS.

NOTHING has been said thus far of the relationship of the cross to the problem as a whole. Reference has been made to it in passing; but its pivotal position in the Messiahship of Jesus has been passed by, because it could not be dealt with as a side issue. It is, in fact, the most important item in the entire discussion, since the cross is the vital element in that Messiahship. Without it the life of Jesus means no more than the life of other great teachers; for the redemption of mankind thus becomes merely academic.

In the early days of the Church no one had any doubts about the meaning of the cross. It stood for an atonement — the atonement — made by God himself for the sins of men, “that He might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” Men understood Paul’s words in those days and took them at their face value. And they saw no reason for doing otherwise. Why should they?

To-day all that is changed. Men rebel at the idea of an atonement. They do not consider any such thing necessary. They have lost their sense of sin and of its exceeding sinfulness, and they imagine that Paul did not know what he was talking about and that they surpass him in wisdom and in the power to grasp the intricacies of deep theological problems.

Indeed, ministers supposedly orthodox glory in the fact that they reject the idea that God demands satisfaction for transgressed law, and they accordingly go to extremes and deny that the cross means an atonement for the sins of men. To them it is merely a symbol of some sort; but what it symbolizes or in what way the symbol is pertinent is never satisfactorily set forth in their explanation of things theological.

They imagine that they cover the ground — they try hard enough — and make it all very clear. They do — about as clear as mud:

As a matter of fact, they signally fail, because they utterly ignore the basis of the problem and look only at their own perversion of the situation. They distort the truth and then hold that they alone have it! The teachings of the Bible count for nothing, in opposition to their views, and no one of them, so long as he embraces "liberalism," tries to understand what those teachings really mean or on what they are based. He is too well satisfied with his own judgment.

They certainly do not mean that God is a bloodthirsty tyrant who exacts the pound of flesh in every case and has no mercy on the sinner. If He exacts the pound of flesh, it is because that is the only way in which He can have mercy on the sinner. That is a side of the matter utterly lost sight of nowadays.

The trouble originates largely in men's ideas about law. Man-made laws are so imperfect, and at times so detrimental to the well-being of the community, that many have come to view all laws with a certain amount of

contempt, and so imagine that God's laws are to be classed with those made by men.

Nothing could be further from the truth. God's laws are basic and immutable. If they are transgressed, the penalty must be paid in some way, and there is no avenue of escape open to the transgressor. When a man touches a hot stove, God does not say: "If you do that again, dearie, I shall have to let the stove burn you." He lets it burn him then and do it in a hurry.

That is the way a Boston school-teacher of unusual acumen used to sum up the situation, and she was right.

Men call such phenomena "natural law," and accept that law as final and just. Its uniformity enables them to live in safety in the midst of dangers all about them, and its very certainty is a necessary part of the ability to so live. If the stove burned in some instances but not in others, men would be in perpetual uncertainty and unsafe.

Moral law is just as fixed and certain as natural law; and yet there is a difference, because the penalty of transgressed moral law must be cumulative in order to be just. Its penalties cannot be immediate for two reasons. First, such an arrangement might endanger the very existence of the race by opening the door to its possible destruction. Second, if the penalties were immediate, virtue and righteousness would both be excluded from this planet.

Righteousness is the selection of rightness when one is tempted to do what is not right. If the failure to choose the right meant an immediate penalty, fear alone would settle the matter, and men would have no choice. That

means that virtue would be impossible as well as righteousness; for it is the choice of what is right or good in the face of allurements to choose what is not right or good which constitutes virtue, and there is no alternative.

In this matter, God himself has no choice; for the very nature of things is such that there can be no choice. Two mountains cannot be produced without a depression between them, and virtue cannot exist without the opportunity to do what is wrong and — apparently — suffer no harm.

Nevertheless, "God is not mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap." Paul was right in this, as elsewhere, and modern views do not destroy his position. Men may seem to escape this law. They seemed to David to escape it. And then he beheld their latter end and understood.

"The wages of sin is death." Paul made no mistake when he said that. Sin inevitably leads to death in the Biblical sense — to separation from God. It can do nothing else. Two cannot walk together except they be agreed, and the very presence of God would be utterly intolerable for a sinner. It would, in fact, be hell for him. No other outcome would be possible.

The word translated "wages" is suggestive. It is ὀψώνιον, "provisions" or "money for provisions," "supplies and pay for an army." The same word is found in Latin, *obsonium*, "food eaten with bread," "fish" (in particular). Sin is therefore personified. It supplies its votaries with food and pay; but the food and pay end in separation from God.

For that there is absolutely no help, unless a way can be found to bridge the chasm and make reconciliation possible. The penalty cannot be abrogated.

In the nature of things no fiat is able to remove it. It must stand until it can be satisfied in some way and the sinner is made to realize what he has been guilty of in his disobedience. His whole attitude must be changed.

No amount of mere forgiveness can do that. In fact, forgiveness itself is an impossibility unless the sinner repents and is willing to accept it. It requires two to make forgiveness a possibility; for forgiveness implies reconciliation, and reconciliation is a matter of two personalities, not of one.

In human relationships these things are plain enough. An erring child cannot be taken back into the heart of its parents unless it is willing to be so taken. So long as it is in rebellion and will have none of them, its parents are incapable of taking it back, no matter how much they may long to do so.

If there is to be any reuniting of the parents and child, the child must have its part in the transaction, and it must repent and forsake its folly.

Moreover, it must suffer the pangs of an awakened conscience before it can go even that far, and its parents must suffer agonies of their own for its sin and rebellion. In addition to that, they must make conditions conform to facts as they are. The prodigal son was received with open arms; but he got no more of his father's property.

That all went to the other son. The prodigal had spent his and had no right whatever to anything else.

His father recognized that fact and therefore told the other son that all his possessions were his.

No other course would have been just or right. To give the boy more would have constituted a reward for sin, rewarded, to be sure, but sin just the same in the last analysis, and it would have been plain robbery of the older son.

Fear of some such act on the father's part may have prompted the indignation displayed by the older son, and that may explain his refusal to cooperate. He felt that the younger son should suffer the penalty of his folly and not be rewarded by being given more, just because he had returned. He did not know, in fact, but that he had come back in the hope of getting more to squander. That was not a pleasant thought.

His repentance did not and could not restore his lost portion, and the father had no right to make it good by rewarding the other boy as he would have had to do in case he had contemplated any such action.

Sentiment is as killed as ever justice appears to be, and it often does wrong in consequence. Sentiment would give the younger more — and rob the other without compensation!

It is this failure to see the other side of a thing which constitutes the basis for much wrong thinking. Men see only what is close by, or just beyond their noses, and fail to see something of far more importance in the distance. Or they look at one side of a matter and do not care to think whether there be any other side. That, in itself, is a sort of sin and not commendable.

Human laws are sometimes passed without penalties; but such laws are not laws in reality. They are, rather, precepts or recommendations. And they are so taken. They have no abiding influence, unless the pressure of public opinion furnishes a substitute for the omitted penalties.

If one's fellows universally, or even generally, condemn a failure to conform to the law, that condemnation in itself constitutes a penalty. Moreover, it is a penalty that few men care to face. It means a sort of ostracism, and ostracism is the most dreadful thing that can happen in society to any man. In effect, it amounts to a kind of solitary confinement. It ends communion with his fellows and puts him outside the pale of comradeship.

We cannot escape these basic laws of our nature. Nor can we abrogate that old saw, "You can't keep your cake and eat it too." Men seek to get around that truth in all sorts of ways. They fail. They cannot do otherwise.

People have children and hand them over to paid assistants and then wonder why the children are not devoted to them in their old age! Were they devoted to the children in their infancy and childhood? If they were not, they have no just claim on the devotion of their children in later life.

They reap what they sowed. They wanted no responsibility, and the children want none. They put their own pleasure first. So do the children. They set the example and can have no excuse for blaming the children when they follow it in their turn. They want something for nothing. It cannot be had.

Some parents seem to think that money and indulgence will make their children into reliable men and women and into men and women who will look upon them with gratitude. The chances are all the other way. Solomon's wisdom is usually justified by the outcome; but men think themselves wiser than Solomon. He is "out of date." No matter. He was right.

At a Bible conference in Kentucky some years ago, a noted preacher and evangelist told a story of a man and his son, and his hearers wondered whether he might not be the man himself. None of them will forget the story.

The boy was full of life and became a torment to the neighborhood. He was expelled from two schools and did considerable destruction about his father's place. Then his father woke up to the situation. He did some thinking and finally summoned the boy to a conference in the woodshed. He told him to take off his coat. The boy was fifteen or sixteen years old and refused.

Then his father became stern and told him to take it off or he would do it for him. The change in his father was so startling that the coat came off. A good dressing-down with a whip followed, and it was kept up till the boy wept and pleaded for mercy. That was sound psychology. It was effective.

After that the father said: "Your misdemeanors thus far have been my fault. Hereafter they will be yours; for I shall punish you whenever you deserve it and not let you go as heretofore." That settled it. The boy became a model after that and made no more trouble for his family and friends.

When another boy, the son of a Massachusetts father, complained to his parent because he allowed his sister more leeway than he did him, the father replied: "When I am as sure that you will do right as I am that Marion will, I shall be only too glad to give you your head and allow you to do as you like." That was a point of view new to the boy; but he saw what was involved and decided to be worthy of his father's confidence.

Men little realize that God works on similar principles. He punishes transgressors, and He has hedged sin about with all sorts of penalties. No penalties have been set up for righteousness. It is not hedged in.

It is not made attractive in itself at first, because it must not be alluring at the beginning, if men are to be righteous themselves. It grows more attractive the longer it is followed, while sin becomes more and more hateful and repulsive to all beholders. All of which is a part of God's mercy.

Moreover, all of these things are elements in the problem of the cross. No one of them can be ignored. God cannot choose the course of erring human parents who make a failure of life and then make a success of it himself. He cannot stultify himself as they do, even if men insist that He ought to do things that will result in self-stultification.

He has formed us in his own image with his moral qualities, and we cannot run counter to that image and succeed in moral matters. If we pervert that image, the fault is our own, and we must take the consequences. In other words, we must suffer or some one else must suffer

for us. There is no escape, if we could only realize it, for transgression. Some one must suffer.

Many a mother does just that. It is her agony, oftentimes, that stops the prodigal and turns his steps backward. She suffers in his place and so influences him to repent. But sin is like a debt. Debts have to be paid in full or in part, and some one has to pay them.

All of us are debtors to God. We owe all that we have and are to him, and we cannot pay the bill. We also owe him our absolute allegiance as well as our consecrated service — and we fail to pay. Then we run up another debt of ingratitude and sin, and we fancy that it can be wiped off the slate by a fiat!

That is sheer nonsense. In the very nature of things it cannot be done. A parent or teacher who tries out any such plan becomes, deservedly, the butt of the children who come under his influence. In fact, he is soon despised for his weakness and condemned as “dead easy.” And yet men think that God ought to be that sort of a parent!

Nay, they go even further and assert that He is that sort of a parent! They do not see that if He were such a being as that He would necessarily cease to be God, because He would not deserve to be the ruler of the universe if He were so lacking in a sense of justice. He could not claim the respect of mankind on such a basis any more than a human being can, and He is the responsible head of the universe. Is He the God “nobody knows”?

Mercy is not and cannot be a substitute for justice. It may temper justice; but that is as far as it can go. When it is displaced by justice, there may be undue

severity; but when justice is displaced by mercy, laxity and excess are both encouraged, and the ultimate end of the process is disintegration and death. Justice and mercy are both necessary for the well-being of the world. Without either, failure is certain.

And yet men scowl at justice and berate it inordinately. Possibly they are aware of what it would mean for them. They exalt mercy. Perhaps they hope to obtain it in abundance and so escape their deserts. They will not.

If they own a vicious animal, they have no compunctions about destroying it or otherwise disposing of it. And yet they did not create that animal. Nor did they give it birth. They may have controlled its birth; but beyond that it was not possible for them to go.

Ownership is all that they can claim; but even so they have the power of life and death over the creature, and they use it without hesitation. Moreover, they do so justly as a rule.

God created the animal, and He created them! They are his creatures just as truly as the animal was their property, and He has a right to act accordingly. If they are vicious, He has a right to destroy them completely if He will. If He does not, that is because He tempers justice with mercy. It is not because He is under any obligation to them in any sense whatever. He is under obligation to his own moral nature, but that is all.

If this seems horrible, is it any the less true? Is it not, in fact, just plain common-sense? Cannot God destroy vicious men for the good of the world quite as righteously as you yourself can destroy a vicious dog for

the sake of your children? Can you be consistent and claim otherwise?

What, then, becomes of the modern indignation over the destroyed Canaanites of Biblical times? Was God untrue to his moral nature in doing that for the purpose of making a Messiah a possibility in after years? Would He have been true to his moral nature if He had not done it?

That moral nature does not differ in kind from the moral nature given us at the beginning, and our moral nature demands protection for the innocent as well as a fitting penalty for crime. We put such penalties into our laws, and we do it in large measure to protect the innocent. Moreover, such action on our part is right, even if sentimentalists do immediately set about to override those penalties. They are utterly inconsistent in so doing.

Women weep over murderers and forget their innocent victims. They send flowers to condemned men and never think of sending them to those whom their murderous act bereaved. They condone all sorts of misdeeds and pity the doers. Why do they never pity those who have been wronged by the culprits? They actually forget that there are any such people.

If they would only divide up their sympathy and apply some of it to those who have been wronged, they would get over their sentimentality and learn to detest sin as they ought. It is the most hateful thing in the universe, and God hates it as it deserves. He ought to hate it with a perfect hatred in simple justice to our

welfare. That is why He cannot condone it. He would cease to be just if He did anything of the sort.

How, then, can He forgive the sinner when he repents? There is only one possible way — by providing a substitute for him to bear his sin and make atonement for it. In no other way can He be just and maintain his sovereignty as God. He has rightly and justly decreed that sin must be punished, and He must live up to that decree.

No other course would or could be right or just, and any other course would be inconsistent and ridiculous. There is no question about men when they do that sort of thing. They are laughed at. They are impotent. He would be too.

As no adequate substitute could be found upon earth, He provided one — his other self, his own son! That is what He did in sending him onto the earth to live and die as a man. He was our substitute when he hung on the cross. He died that we might live, that God might be able to forgive the sinner without condoning sin, that He might obey and not abrogate his own laws — in short, that He might be just and the justifier of those who believe on Jesus. The “liberal” falls down here.

If God were to attempt to forgive sin without such an atonement, penalty for sin would become meaningless, and all the commandments against sin would cease to be effective even if they deserved to be binding. They would amount to nothing more than precepts, in reality, and would cease to be veritable commands.

They could not be veritable commands without the atonement; for penalties go with broken laws, and there

would be no penalties if sin could be forgiven by fiat. Indeed, the whole situation would become ridiculous, not to say impossible, if God were to attempt to forgive sin by fiat.

Men cannot be made good by law, and for a similar reason sin cannot be forgiven by fiat. One thing is just as impossible as the other. Men are made good by the exercise of their own wills, by their own choices, and sin, therefore, involves an atonement and reconciliation in the very nature of things. The sinner himself realizes that, and it explains the universal penance of the heathen world. The instinct is perfectly sound even if the effort is futile.

Men in jail are good — outwardly. They obey the laws — outwardly. But they are not good, in fact, until they elect of their own free wills to obey the law and eschew evil. Even a child should realize that.

The basic principle is exactly the same in the case of a sinner. He cannot be made good by any sort of a fiat, and until he is made good he cannot possibly be happy, to say nothing of being blessed, in the presence of God. The very idea is absurd. A vital moral change is necessary. He must cease to be a sinner and do so voluntarily, and when that happens he begins to realize his awful guilt. He has incurred a just penalty, and he wants it paid. If he does not think of any such thing, he has a lot more assurance than is warranted, and he is, to that extent, inferior to a heathen. His "liberalism" won't alter that.

In a famous English school, a favorite pupil once transgressed a rule and incurred the penalty of a flogging. A

somewhat delicate lad, he had not intended to transgress, and the case had extenuating circumstances. Nevertheless, the rule must be obeyed. English justice demanded that, and the master as well as the school so realized. To square the account he took the flogging himself, and no boy in that school ever forgot the lesson.

There is nothing in the world that so commands universal respect as absolute even-handed justice. It is British justice that has made the British Empire a possibility. And it is God's justice that makes this world a fit place to live in. It was Thomas Huxley who said, "The absolute justice of the system of things is as clear to me as any scientific fact." Avowed agnostic though he was, he had looked deep enough into matters to recognize the truth.

The system of things is just, because God is just. But if God is to be just, He cannot say one thing in the moral world and do another. He must be as consistent as that English master was, and to do so He must exact a penalty for the sins of the world. Without it the sinner himself would not be satisfied. That is why God does exact a penalty and then pays it himself, and it is that death on the cross that breaks the sinner's stubborn will and leads him to repentance. Without that death there would be no repentance.

Now, observe another thing. When God gave Moses the ten commandments, He supplied him with the rules for the game of life. If we refuse to play the game by the rules, we deserve to be thrown out entirely. Even the animals must obey them as far as they can, as Ernest

Thompson Seton has so beautifully shown, and it is useless for men to try to escape them. To refuse to obey them is to incur a just and well-deserved penalty. We cannot avoid it, and that penalty must be paid in some way.

If we do not or cannot pay it, some one else must. It must be satisfied. There is no dodging that conclusion or squirming out of it. If it is not paid, justice is not done, and when justice is not done an injustice is done as a matter of course. Shallow thinkers overlook that fact and prate about God's being too good to punish his children.

Such persons do not even know what a good parent is. A good parent is under obligation to punish his children whenever they need it; for he knows perfectly well that he will do them a wrong otherwise. The failure to allow children to suffer the consequences of their own wrongdoing is suicidal. It leads them deeper and deeper into sin and makes them callous.

It is the dearth of good parents that is largely responsible for the utter lack of a sense of responsibility on the part of the modern young person. As an Italian immigrant once put it in talking to me, "They are no good — they want nothing but a good time." He knew what he was talking about. The statement was too largely true to be encouraging.

And this unfortunate state of things can be traced directly, in part, to our shallow ideas about the atonement. If men only realized how necessary an atonement such as the Bible specifies really is, they would

not so blithely condone sin and waste pity on the sinner. They would condemn sin and seek to save the sinner from further transgressions.

Instead of that, they condemn all mention of sin! It is merely misdirected virtue as they look at things. The results are plain, and all men can see the harvest that is ready for the reaping.

As long ago as July, 1907, in an article in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, attention was called to the methods of Judge "Ben" Lindsey and the suggestion was made that letting boys off because they are boys, without winning them to some better course, must mean the development of criminals.

The "carbarn murderers" were mentioned as graduates from such a school, and the prediction was made that "a similar crop is growing in many a large city to-day." Later, in January, 1916, in another article in the same quarterly, these words appeared: "We've got our 'bandits' just as we expected to have, and we are now wondering how big the crop will be."

People do not realize that the active hostility of the police was one of the strongest factors in Judge Lindsey's success. It enabled him to enlist the fighting instinct of the boys to "show 'em" and to divert their surplus energy from destructive mischief to constructive merit.

Without that element, Judge Lindsey's methods may be deadly, because they foster and encourage crime. To a gang of boys or young men "probation" is a joke. As one of them said to a policeman of my acquaintance, when he was asked why he helped break into a store,

"Why shouldn't I? They can't do anything to me. I'm on probation now." To him probation was a license for further crime.

Gospel without law behind it is a snare and a delusion. It encourages license and makes a farce of justice. No wonder that we excel all other civilized countries in the number of our murders per thousand of our population. We actually encourage murder by our mistaken ideas about justice. We save murderers' lives, but forget to notice that the number of their victims is sometimes immediately doubled by actual count. We would save more lives if we stopped saving those of the men who do murder.

But if this is true, — can you disprove it? — in what possible way can God justly condone sin? If He were to condone sin and so encourage it, could He continue to be just? Nay, could He even continue to be merciful? Is it merciful to pursue a course which leads to the encouragement of sin?

A young criminal sentenced to jail asked to speak to his mother. Given permission, he stooped down and savagely bit her ear. She screamed, and the judge called him to account. His answer was, "She is to blame, she put me here, she helped me to escape all punishment for my other crimes." Was he wrong?

Looked at in the larger way, sin cannot be justly condoned even by God himself. It must be punished or it must be atoned for. And there is no avenue of escape. Justice demands it. Mercy demands it. The sinner's own conscience demands it. And the well-being of all

mankind demands it. If sentimentality cannot see this, so much the worse for sentimentality. It is itself sinful if it is not actually criminal in its ultimate consequences.

An old farmer once said to me that it never did for a woman to have a pet horse. When asked why, the answer was, "She'll kill it with kindness, she'll save it from work and overfeed it, and the horse will die of colic." Mistaken kindness that. Its results are far from kind. And yet men want that sort of thing for themselves in their relation to God! They are sadly wrong.

But if an atonement for sin is necessary and Jesus made such an atonement, what becomes of the idea that he was merely a man? Could any man, no matter how able and exalted he might be, make an atonement of the sort required? Could a man who was a bastard, or little better than a bastard if he be given the advantage of any possible doubt, do it?

Is there any way of escaping the conclusion that Jesus must have been the Son of God — if he made any sort of an atonement for our sins? If he did not suffer and die that we might live, what did he do on the cross? What construction can you put on his death if you eliminate this one? Was it a mere accident that he died as a malefactor?

And if you cannot escape the conclusion that he so died in order that we might be justified and received back into fellowship with God, what place does he occupy in God's plan for our redemption?

Is the Bible wrong when it so distinctly teaches that "without shedding of blood is no remission"? That is

its lesson in the sacrifices of the Old Testament, and that is its lesson in the crucifixion. Can you destroy it by your unbelief? If you cannot, the lesson must stand. But, if you can, the whole Bible topples with that destruction, and it can then be discarded.

Like a scarlet thread running through both the Old and the New Testament is this doctrine of sacrifice for sin. In the early days it was the pascal lamb. At the end it was Christ offered once for all for the sins of men.

The teaching is too plain to be escaped, and, unless you reject the authority of the entire Bible — you cannot make your own selections — and imagine that you can rewrite the theology of the Scriptures, you must accept it as it stands. Such a rewriting has been attempted, and the World War showed where it led. Its blasphemy was patent, and yours would be likewise. Human errors in the text do not vitiate the inner content of the Book, and that proclaims Jesus as our passover.

But, if he was, he must have been God manifest in the flesh. Nothing short of that could possibly meet the situation and do the work. No human being was competent to do it. Indeed, a human being would have amounted to no more than did the men sacrificed in the *puruṣa-medhas* of India or in the similar rites of the Aztecs. None of them redeemed mankind; for none of them could redeem mankind. That, however, is what Jesus did, and the lives of saints still prove it.

The testimony of the cross, then, as well as that of the resurrection, indicates plainly that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God, God incarnate in the flesh, the Messiah

of prophecy — the Savior of the world. And the spectacle of his vicarious suffering and death leads men to repentance and to him in every land. He has been lifted up from the earth and is drawing all men unto him. He was therefore no mere man. He was the Son of God and in that way God incarnate.

CHAPTER XII.

CONCLUSION.

IT now remains to sum up the situation and consider its possibilities. What, in reality, was Jesus? According to the law, a bastard is "a child begotten and born outside of lawful matrimony." The word also includes, according to law, a child born when the husband has been absent for a year.

It will be observed that the letter of the law can be met and bastardy escaped, regardless of the paternity of the child, if the mother is only living with a lawful husband at the time it is begotten, — or born, as far as that is concerned, — no matter who its father may happen to have been.

That, however, is not the spirit of the law, and it never can be, nor will any man, outside of the legal profession, ever accept any such interpretation as covering the real meaning of the word — unless he has personal reasons for so doing.

Any child begotten of a woman by any man not her husband is begotten out of wedlock, and there is no denying the fact. If the woman is the wife of another man, the child that is born is born out of lawful matrimony; for it is not borne to the woman's husband, and no amount of sophistry can make it so borne.

It is therefore not legitimate, and it cannot be. It is the product of adultery, and adultery is not legitimate.

Any child, accordingly, that belongs in either of the two classes named is, in reality, a bastard, and a bastard it must remain. To deny it is to quibble.

Now, this represents the exact status of Jesus, provided he was not what the New Testament claims that he was. On that basis, however, the malicious flings of the "Toldoth Jeshu" ("fool," "Absalom," "son of Pandera," "son of Stada," — a scurrilous epithet? — etc.) are not to be wondered at. Indeed, they may even be justified in some small measure, and that course cannot be avoided, unless the implication that he was a bastard is emphatically repudiated.

Technically, Jesus was not born out of wedlock, because Joseph and Mary were already married when he saw the light; and yet he was so born, nevertheless, since, as Matthew expressly says (i. 18-25), Mary was never a wife to Joseph until after the birth of Jesus. For that reason, Joseph could not possibly have been his father, so that any who believe that he was must account for a preposterous lie as a condition precedent.

No legal dodging of the point at issue can, accordingly, be pertinent in this connection. Jesus was either the Christ, the Son of God, or he was a most unaccountable and amazing bastard, as already intimated.

Any effort to dodge that conclusion simply makes the matter worse, since it takes the form of one of those pernicious perversions of fact, of which lawyers, on the basis of some legal technicality, are so often guilty.

Many a scoundrel is kept out of jail by just such means, to the detriment of the legal profession, and it is this

same habitual twisting of the truth that has led so many men, including members of the bar, as I happen to know personally from the admissions of the men themselves, to grow distrustful of the law. It has likewise led to acts of open violence by making the law hateful to the lower classes, who have now become too intelligent not to recognize the unfortunate truth for themselves.

What, then, is the rational conclusion in this matter? Is the bastardy horn of the dilemma tenable on any ground whatever? Is the notion that he may have been the son of Joseph? Could he have been such a child, conceived in sin and later legitimized by the marriage of Joseph and Mary?

Would the laws of nature and heredity, those doughty champions of all rationalists, by any possibility permit such an outcome as the product of a Jesus Christ to materialize under the conditions here referred to?

Could a child of either sort, or of any sort merely human, fulfill the requirements of the case? Could he remain a free agent and yet be so dominated by the spirit of God as to represent him, present in the flesh? Are not the two things mutually exclusive?

Is there, in short, any course left open, on psychological, philosophical, theological, or biological grounds, for such a manifestation of God, save the one laid down in the Gospel narrative?

If God's spirit entered into a child, born of a virgin, and then, with the child's own consent, dominated its life, the power of the Holy Spirit would necessarily be greater in the child than the hereditary element received

from the mother's personality could be, and the divine and the human would thus be made to blend, precisely as the Bible indicates that they did do. How else could the thing have been done? What is the scientific view in such a case as that? Is there any other way out?

As to expressions like "Son of Joseph," little more need be said. Scandinavian usage covers the ground admirably, and the Samaritans still follow the practice in naming their children. English has forgotten the meaning of the suffix -son, and Palestinian Greek occupied a position very similar with reference to the familiar Homeric patronymic -δης or -ίδης (-δα-, -ίδα-). A translation of the Hebrew (Aramaic) words is accordingly resorted to, in each instance, as the best available method of rendering the names. That, however, does not alter the facts.

Moreover, beside Bar-Joseph must be placed such names as Barnabas ("Son-of-exhortation"), Barsabas ("Son-of-Saba"), Bar-Jesus' ("Son-of-Joshua" — the magician with Sergius Paulus), Bartholomew ("Son-of-Talmai"), Barabbas ("Son-of-the-father"), Bar-Cocheba ("Son-of-the-star" — the leader of the Jewish insurrection suppressed in 135 A.D.), Bartimaeus ("Son-of-Timaeus"), etc. "Son-of" was therefore a title rather than a statement of fact.

Jesus received the name of Mary's husband; but to give the child his name was absolutely the only course that was open for Joseph to take. Put yourself in his place and see how you could squirm out of it and not be a cad.

A plain Christian working man of my acquaintance once did a thing of that kind. He gave the boy that was born his name and brought him up as his own. He never dodged or squirmed. He was too much of a man. He loved the woman, and he married her to protect her by assuming the responsibility himself. In a sense, that was what Joseph did.

Jesus, however, was no such child as that. He was what he claimed to be, the Son of God. As such, he had a complex nature and a complex personality. When life is endowed with soul, something more than a mere plant must result. When soul is endowed with spirit, something more than a mere animal must result. And when a human frame becomes the earthly tabernacle of the Most High, something more than a mere man must result.

The soul of an animal differs from that of a man, because the latter has been permeated by a spirit and therefore greatly exalted above the animal plane. In a sense, we may say that as life plus a soul (animal life) is to life alone (plant life), so is soul and life plus a spirit (human life) to soul and life alone (animal life).

In each instance, there is a distinct gain. In a way, Christ completes the pyramid and becomes its apex.

But we may approach the matter from another angle. Every man gives his child a certain reproduction of his own personality, and the paternal element can often be easily discovered in a given child, because it is so well marked.

Now, when God, not as the Creator in all his majesty but as the Holy Spirit so limited as to meet the require-

ments of man's limitations, chose to bring into being a new creature, a God-man, by some process similar to those that are so often met with and yet are so little understood, — remember Luther Burbank and his twenty-three new varieties of potatoes from one lone potato-ball, — making the “sport” in this instance an ovum fructified in some fashion without sexual agency; He supplied the inherited paternal personality, somewhat as an ordinary father does, and in some such way made it possible to manifest himself in the flesh. In other words, creative power was used directly, instead of indirectly through the agency of a human father.

God did not do this with the ordinary limitations of men; and yet He caused the entire process to conform, as far as possible, to those limitations, in order that the new being might resemble an ordinary man as far as he was able to resemble him and still retain his divine nature. He thus became an “only begotten son” — though having had a previous existence — as well as a Savior comprehensible to the men of all ages. (See p. 249 f.)

What is there in this doctrine that is irrational? What is there, on the other hand, in the doctrine that Jesus was merely a man of unusual powers, provided we once admit the evidence of prophecy, the evidence of the works that he did (not only on the testimony of his friends but also on that of his enemies), the evidence of transformed lives in our own day, the evidence of peace and courage in the face of bereavement (where there is no other sustaining force, if that condition is insisted on), and the evidence of a Church that is slowly but surely filling the earth,

as it was foretold that it should — what is there, I say, in that doctrine of mere humanity that is rational?

Does not such a doctrine, in fact, require an unusual amount of credulity on the part of those who accept it? Could a mere man do such things?

Is it possible to deny his works in the face of the evidence? Is it possible to deny honestly, in its entirety, the prophetic element in the Scriptures or the fulfilment of the prophetic utterances at least in part? Can the captivity and the prognostications referring thereto, not only in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and others of the prophets but also in the Pentateuch, be disposed of as not pertinent or as not historically true?

Can such evidence as the life of Jerry McAuley, the redeemed river thief, be ignored? Can Christian experience be denied or refuted? Can the Church itself be explained as a product of evolution without any divine element in its foundation and upbuilding? And if these things cannot be dodged, what then?

Will you find a really satisfactory method of escape in the modern habit of resorting to Hindu pantheism, — as set forth in the *Upaniṣads*, whose teachings are summed up in the *Vedānta*, or “End-of-knowledge,” where it is maintained that man is but a part of the universal “All-soul” temporarily isolated in a human frame, and that he will ultimately be reabsorbed into the “All-soul” with a total loss of identity, a condition made much of in the Buddhistical doctrine of *Nirvāṇa*, — and, assuming that miracles can be disposed of in that manner, since a curious pantheistic refinement, under the euphonious phrase,

"the immanence of God," can be so manipulated as to make miracles appear to be natural, thus succeed in solving the problem so that it will stay solved?

Are miracles natural, as a matter of fact? Are they not rather supernatural, in the sense that they transcend the natural as we know it, even if they are done with the help of forces well known to the deity but not known or not understood by men? What is the rational conclusion in this instance? Does a monistic philosophy of the pantheistic sort satisfy? Does it meet the innate convictions and longings of a man's spiritual nature?

In the Waltham watch factory, among the various automatic machines, one is found which makes screws having a diameter of twenty-six one-thousandths of a centimeter, or about one quarter of a millimeter, as measured by the calipers. That is approximately one one-hundredth of an inch.

The head is about twice the diameter of the screw proper, and the screw itself is relatively short. Each watch contains four such screws.

Now, this automatic machine turns them out with astonishing speed and marvelous accuracy, and they drop with unerring regularity into the receiving pan in a stream of running oil. The machine needs no attention, for the most part, save that of gathering up the finished product.

Would any man be credited with sanity, if he entertained the notion that machines like that were the result of a blind force acting on matter? Would he not demand purpose backed by intelligence, and intelligence of a high order, as a prerequisite?

Well, then, how about that far more wonderful bit of mechanism, the human hand — and the brain behind it? Were they, or either one of them, the product of a blind force without intelligence, acting in and through matter? What could that force be? And if you once admit purpose backed by intelligence, how can you be rid of personality? Could matter plan your mind?

It cannot be a mere animal intelligence, and that man is the highest intelligence in existence is unthinkable. The order everywhere apparent in the universe is incomprehensible, if there is no intelligent purpose behind it. But if there is such an intelligent purpose, there must be a purposer — a personal God.

What is there, then, that is irrational in the supposition that He has revealed himself to men in a sacred Book known as his inspired Word? And why should we attempt to rid ourselves of it by tearing it to pieces? Can we do so? Will canons of criticism, so called, suffice to accomplish the task?

If these same canons were applied to this series of discussions, they could not fail to produce astonishing results. The careful discrimination, observed from the start, in the use of Jesus, Christ, and Jesus Christ would count for nothing, because critics care little for the content of words, as compared with their form, and sometimes they do not even seem to realize that words have such a thing as a content. It appears to be entirely sufficient for their purposes that verbal expressions have a form, and the meaning put into the words is a matter of no consequence from their point of view.

Such men often pervert an author's meaning, either because they do not have sufficient insight to understand him or because they are more concerned with the business of criticism than they are with the truth. Men dispute and do not understand each other, and both may be right in a measure and also wrong in a measure, while not even touching the points made by their opponents. And they may be carping critics at that.

A horse will ignore the stubble in his crib and confine his attention to the good hay that happens to be mixed with it. From this habit, we get the expression, "horse sense."

It sometimes appears to be a pity that men do not resemble horses in that particular more than most of them do. Some of them would be less brilliant than they are; but the world would be better off, and there would be fewer perversions of the truth.

In our own day, men have actually attributed the great European war to the breakdown of Christianity! They forgot that the warring nations were not really Christian, though they were so in name.

When men exchange the Church for the beer garden as a regular thing on Sunday and spend the week with never a thought of God's commandments as an obligation in their daily lives; when they exchange the principles of righteousness for an imperial policy, making self-interest the supreme good; when they think more of "wine, women, and song" than they do of religion, putting pleasure before virtue; when their theologians tear the Bible to pieces, in the effort to climb to the top and so secure financial

preferment; when the laity desecrate churches and choose free-thinking rather than the dictates of religion, and self-indulgence rather than the austerities of a life of righteousness; when the wealthy cruelly maltreat helpless savages for the sake of gain or rather countenance a course of that kind as necessary; when they hideously wrong young girls and rob them of their most priceless possession; when opium is forced on an alien people at the cannon's mouth; and when the laity and the clergy alike vie with one another in substituting a so-called liberality for Christianity of the original pure and simple type: — it is not Christianity that is breaking down, when they fly at one another's throats, but their own miserable substitute for it; and the outcome only emphasizes the lack of Christianity in the people who, under the guise of progress, have exchanged it for liberalism, because, forsooth, it appears too narrow to fall in with their views of what life ought to be.

Liberalism has now been put to the test, and it has gone to pieces. That is what ails the world to-day, and Christianity of the thoroughgoing sort is the only possible cure.

Present conditions are not final. Christ himself intimated that faith would ebb, as the present dispensation neared its end, and that, to all appearance, almost none would be left on earth. That is the way things begin to look already, and a world-wide change of some sort even now looms large on the political horizon.

What it will be no one knows. And yet we do know this. Where Christ is really loved and obeyed, there

peace reigns supreme. Human problems are solved. Hate departs and love abides. Nay, even a community of cannibals is transformed, and a hell of violence becomes a bit of heaven on earth.

This is no dream. The thing has been done. Has it no bearing in the premises? And does it throw no light on his nature and his claims? What king ever did a thing like that through the work of his ministers?

The Bible promises punishment for sin. It promises punishment to nations for sin. It promised dispersion to the Jews, and they are even now to be found in every part of the world as aliens. It also promised them survival, and they still survive, distinct and unique. "God is not mocked." Sin has been lying at the door in Europe, and it must be atoned for. Nor can there be any permanent peace until sin is banished and Christ is allowed to rule, as he should.

It must be clear, even to the dullest, that the boasted "refinement and civilization" of our own day have broken down as a conserving force, because they are inherently selfish. They are, in fact, merely an outward veneer rather than an inward conviction, and, as such, they have been stripped from their votaries, leaving them exposed to the world in all their nakedness.

"What think ye of Christ?" The answer not only discloses the peculiarities of a man's intellectual life but also and especially those of his spiritual life. "Canst thou by searching find out God?" Spiritual discernment comes not by study but by communion with one's Heavenly Father.

Pride of intellect is an insuperable barrier to such communion. It must be so in the nature of things. "Blessed are the poor in spirit: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." The men and the women in that kingdom are the salt of the earth to-day. The fact speaks for itself. It needs no comment.

Just here I am moved to make a confession. My career has brought me many experiences, but none more lasting than this. After I had completed twenty-three years of study, practically carrying through at the end a double postgraduate course which led to a Ph.D. in Sanskrit and a Phi Beta Kappa key, I met a woman whose testimony in the midweek meetings filled me with astonishment.

Evidently from one of the lower classes, she nevertheless managed to shine among college and theological professors, and I marveled at her power. Finally, I had a chance to talk with her for fifteen minutes and, in that brief conversation, discovered its source.

She had had just six weeks of schooling, enough to learn to read; but she knew her Bible, and she lived with her Lord. She taught me the meaning of many things. "The last shall be first, and the first last." "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation." "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." "Be clothed with humility."

We cannot settle everything for ourselves. We are not competent. Man's feeble reason cannot compass God. Whichever way we turn, we find ourselves involved

in difficulty. God is an inscrutable mystery, and we can never know Him, except as He has revealed himself to us.

Thousands of thousands believe that He has done so and rejoice. And they become different men and women, just so far as they accept his commands and obey them. No others are accredited members of the Kingdom, as Christ himself intimated (Jo. xv. 14).

Do we still hesitate at miracles? Man-formulated laws of nature have broken down in the presence of radium, the discovery of which was largely due to a woman. Is there anything irrational in the supposition that they may also have broken down in the presence of the Maker himself, when He was manifested in the flesh here on earth?

Choose we must, one way or the other, and the refusal to choose is in itself a choice. Which is it? A personal God, or a blind impersonal force? A Creator, or a mere chance happening? A universe based on design, or an endless series of blunderings through countless ages, until things managed somehow to straighten themselves out and assume a semblance of order now become real?

Did forces inherent in matter do all this? And if they did, whence came they? What are they? Mere accidents? Is it a mere accident if gravitation keeps all the worlds in their places? Was there no purpose, no design, in such an outcome? Is there not, somewhere, back of it all, "an inscrutable intelligence"? What is the rational decision, in the light of all the facts? What is yours?

Finally, consider this important point which has been left until the end. Every human child must of necessity

receive its individual life and its inherited personality, as well as its eternal spirit, from some source outside of itself.

It receives its physical life, after the fashion of an animal, from its parents, through the germplasm of procreation. It receives its inherited characteristics in like manner from its parents, although it modifies them at will in the course of its development and maturity. But its spirit — usually, though inaccurately, called its immortal soul — must, in the last analysis, somehow, be God-given. It is made in God's image.

The source of that spirit, if we accept John's testimony, must be the Word that was made flesh to dwell among men; for he says explicitly that "without him was not anything made that was made." Moreover, the Genesis declaration that "God created man in his own image" can only mean that man received a spirit similar to God's, inasmuch as God is a spirit, and it is inconceivable that the reference was merely to man's corporeal form.

The second personality in the Trinity therefore supplied the agency for the creation of man's spirit, or the thing that we sometimes call the *ego* — the man himself, the determining will.

But — observe this fact — when Mary conceived by the Holy Ghost, no created spirit was needed for the child that was to be born. The Word itself, the λόγος, the ultimate source of all human spirits, was available — nay, necessary — as the origin of the *ego* in that instance. The *ego* itself, therefore, partook of the divine nature. It was not a created thing, but a divine one intentionally self-

limited. The Word was thus, in truth, made flesh to dwell with men.

God, manifested as the Holy Spirit, controlled the conception and made it possible, and God, manifested as the Word, supplied from Himself the spirit that was to dwell in that tiny human frame and then grow to such proportions.

The *ego*, or self, of Jesus was accordingly different from that of the ordinary child; for it was a self-existent self and not a created one that tabernacled there for three and thirty years. Now, note what that means.

The child was by nature doubly divine. His paternal ancestry was divine, and his own *ego* was likewise divine. To be true to himself he had to elect the Spirit — he was still free to do otherwise — as his dominating personality and guide. But, in doing so, he only elected another manifestation of the selfhood of God and so acted in accordance with his divine nature.

This fact makes it doubly clear that he was absolutely free in all his choices and even in his domination by the Spirit; for, with the human limitations voluntarily assumed, he must needs obey, within limits, the laws of heredity, so as to be a perfect human being as well as a divine one, and suffer himself to be affected by those laws as far as might be necessary. He did so and became in consequence the Savior of mankind.

The human was necessary as a means to an end; but the divine still prevailed and wrought mightily through that human frame for all men and all time. The merely human would have failed utterly. It was not equal to the task. What think ye, then, of Christ? Was He a

bastard of uncommon power? or was He indeed and in truth the Son of God? Consider Paul's words in Rom. i. 3 as explained in Chapter iv.

If he was the latter, his resurrection loses all its strangeness. With a divine *ego*, the resurrection ceases to be abnormal and becomes natural; for the grave could not master a personality which contained within itself the very source of life. That explains why he rose from the dead. He had the power to reanimate that human frame and to transform it in ascending.

That he did reanimate it there is ample proof. The passage in Josephus cannot be disposed of, although the attempt has been made through assertions that are both extravagant and unwarranted. As a matter of fact, there is not a shred of evidence that any part of it was ever interpolated, and no interpolation or tampering of any sort could possibly have escaped notice, even if it had been performed under ideal conditions.

Such conditions simply did not exist; there was no chance for them to exist, because the Christians never could have obtained either complete control of all the manuscripts or exclusive knowledge of their contents. Indeed, if the surmise that the early fathers did not know of the passage is correct, it follows that some Christian discovered it by accident long after various Jews and Romans had already become acquainted with its contents. The argument based on such ignorance thus becomes a boomerang.

It assumes that Origen and the early fathers did not know of the passage because they did not happen to

mention it, which proves nothing whatever. Possibly they did not know of it; but in that case any interpolation of the words, either in whole or in part, is shown to be an utter impossibility, since it would have to take place at so late a date that the text would be too widely known to be tampered with. Moreover, the document was not a Christian one. It was Jewish — written for Roman readers. Men forget that. It vitiates all their surmisings. They are pure fiction.

Furthermore, the assumption that the passage was once placed before the notices of Pilate, because the remarks of Eusebius so indicate, is wholly gratuitous. It is based on ignorance of ancient methods. Times have changed, and methods have changed with them. In those days men consulted their own memories. In these days men consult books. In those days, as a result of their methods, slight changes in words and in the order of events recalled became inevitable, and an argument based on a fact of that uncertain sort is not worth the paper on which it is written.

The truth is plain enough. Men — scholars are no exception — jump at conclusions because of some impression they get and then support them by a species of wild guessing which is politely known as “over-hasty generalization.” That is what has happened here. The whole argument is superficial and unworthy of confidence. The text is an ancient document, and all such documents must stand, unless direct and positive evidence is forthcoming to prove alterations. No such evidence exists in this case; for that submitted is manufactured and entirely

subjective. It is therefore worthless, and nothing now available can destroy the testimony of Josephus. He tells the truth exactly as he found it, and that should suffice.

A few sidelights appear in heathen literature. Thus Pliny writes to the Emperor Trajan (X. xcvi.) that torture merely brought to light evidence of an absurd and extravagant superstition, after he had already learned that Christians met before light on a stated day — probably Sunday — to pray to Christ and vow to live uprightly. He does not state the nature of the superstition; but it can safely be assumed that it had something to do with the resurrection, since that seems to have been the thing most generally ridiculed. It stopped Paul's speech on Mars Hill.

Celsus, in the second century, regarded it as especially absurd. He assumed that, having been condemned openly, Jesus would have faced his accusers openly in case he had risen from the dead, and he therefore proceeded to impugn the veracity of the witnesses and to ridicule the witnesses themselves.

Lucian might reasonably have been expected to do the same thing; but he does not even mention the matter. He does bear witness to the crucifixion, to the Christian indifference to death, and to the love which Christians of his day showed to one another. Writing in the latter part of the second century, he ridiculed whatever he chanced to meet, especially men who were philosophers. He had little or no faith in human nature, and he regarded the Christians as poor dupes of a Palistinian malefactor,

who had taught them to observe a new system of morals and to worship him.

Now, Jesus himself foretold his resurrection. Indeed, in the course of his ministry he referred on twenty-five different occasions to his coming death and a few times to his rising on the third day.

"Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up" (Jo. ii. 19) was the first instance, though it was not understood until the end of his life. The reference to Jonah (Mt. xii. 40; Lu. xi. 30) was the next. Later he became explicit, intimating plainly that he would arise from the dead on the third day (Mt. xvi. 21; Mk. viii. 31; Lu. ix. 22), and he even told them (Mt. xvii. 9; Mk. ix. 9) not to say anything about the transfiguration until after his resurrection.

That they found it hard to understand may be seen from the way in which he repeated the information (Mt. xvii. 23; Mk. ix. 31) and from his statement that he had power to lay down his life and power to take it again (Jo. x. 17, 18). He went further and claimed to be the resurrection and the life (Jo. xi. 25) and repeated once more the statement that he would rise again on the third day (Mt. xx. 19; Mk. x. 34; Lu. xviii. 33). If he did not so arise, these words of his are egregious falsehoods.

His life, however, makes any such supposition as that impossible, and the empty tomb is an unanswerable argument. It was properly sealed and adequately guarded. His disciples were ignorant and unarmed. No one else was interested in removing the body. But — it disappeared completely.

On the day of Pentecost no one was able to produce it or to tell what had become of it. Peter never would have dared to preach the sermon which he delivered on that occasion if that body had been available. Neither can it be supposed that the apostles would have become the men they did with any such body in existence. To do so, under those conditions, would have been a miracle indeed. But if Christ arose, all becomes clear and natural. That would give reason for courage.

It must be remembered that he died as a malefactor with a curse on such a death (Gal. iii. 13; Deut. xxi. 23). Without a resurrection from the grave, the things that follow are not merely inexplicable, they are strangely miraculous; for a dead man, with such a disgraceful death behind him, never could have built up the early church, beginning in Jerusalem itself. Credulity of a gigantic sort is required to suppose that he could have performed such a task, with only ignorant men to start things; for neither Matthew nor Paul figured in the transaction until later.

Now, all four of the evangelists testify explicitly that Jesus arose from the dead (Mt. xxviii. 6; Mk. xvi. 6; Lu. xxiv. 5, 6; Jo. xx. 13, 14). Matthew (xxviii. 11-15) tells of the lying report of the guards and of its diffusion among the Jews. Luke (xxiv. 13-35) relates how he was seen by two on the way to Emmaus. He (xxiv. 36-43) and John (xx. 19-25) describe the appearance to the apostles in bodily form, while John (xx. 26-29) and Mark (xvi. 14) tell of a second similar appearance, at which Jesus rebuked them, Thomas in particular, for their unbelief.

Later, seven saw him at the Sea of Galilee (Jo. xxi. 1-24), and the eleven saw him on a mountain near by (Mt. xxviii. 16-20). He even stated (Lu. xxiv. 46) that it was written that he should arise on the third day. What he had reference to is not clear, though it may possibly have been Psalm xvi. 10.

But the testimony is not all in; for Luke says (Acts i. 3), "To whom also he showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs, being seen of them forty days, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God"; and Paul (i. Cor. xv. 4-7) states that he was seen of Cephas (Peter) and of the twelve (twice) and of James and of about five hundred at once, most of whom were still living. It is safe to infer that Paul had himself talked with many of them. He gives his own experience and says later (17) that their faith is vain if Christ is not risen.

Well was it said by Thomas Arnold of Rugby, concerning the resurrection of Jesus, that there is "no better-attested fact in human history." He was right. Without it, we must not only provide several incredible miracles, but must also assume that a veritable network of preposterous lies has resulted in the modern Church which is fast becoming universal and in a consequent remodeling of all sorts of men, so that benevolence takes the place of hate and a loving sympathy that of indifferent contempt to suffering.

Luke's "infallible proofs," τεκμηρίοις, are an item and they cannot be ignored. He is now known to have been right about Cyrenius (Quirinius) and Caesar Augustus

(Lu. ii. 1-3), and lack of evidence is not the cause of unbelief.

The will to believe is lacking in reality, and that is the true cause of the trouble. Intellectual honesty is rare. It should be sedulously cultivated. While it is perfectly natural to believe some things and not others, one needs the resort, "To the law and the testimony." Those do well who "hail from Missouri"; but one should keep his mind open and see where things come out before he decides finally what to believe. Hasty decisions are dangerous.

Most men indulge in them. They find some makeshift that appears to remove a difficulty, and — they stop right there. If they would only go on and test matters carefully, there would be less shallow thinking in the world and more reliable results as well. Such results are all too rare.

Scholars assume, for instance, that they have proved, with immense erudition, that Mark was the "source" gospel from which the others drew a part of their information, and they never even suspect how inept that position really is.

Matthew and John had an intimate personal knowledge of all the events. Luke investigated them for himself, and he had about two years to do it in, in Jerusalem itself. Matthew must have had a trained mind to be a publican and keep accounts, and he must have known Greek, as that was the language used for such things. Christ himself assured them that the Spirit would bring all things to their remembrance (Jo. xiv. 26). And we have the

definite record that Mark got his information from Peter's sermons.

The assumption that the gospel writers borrowed their material from written sources is positively absurd. According to a Boston minister who came from Syria, no one in that country to-day will consult a printed book if he can question a living witness. The personal element, he says, is all-important. Written documents were far worse, and the blindness of scholars in these matters is amazing. It needs a volume to state the case adequately, and there it must be left for the present.

Various theories have been advanced to explain away the resurrection. They are all so patently inadequate that they hardly need refuting. The Vision Theory of Strauss, who himself regarded the Resuscitation Theory as absurd, is impossible, as is the notion that the apostles stole and hid the body or resuscitated him. All three have been shown to be preposterous, because they not only involve insurmountable difficulties but also the assumption that Christ himself lied, after, as well as before, his crucifixion.

Jews and Romans are plainly excluded as possible body-snatchers, the Telegram Theory of a Divinely Wrought Vision is clearly and unmistakably fallacious, and the Hallucination Theory is positively ridiculous. Imagine "five hundred at once" being so affected! The hallucination exists only in the heads of the doubters. These theories, like the others, have been abundantly refuted as impossible. Moreover, the miraculous element is not excluded; for nothing but a miracle could make

some of the theories work. In short, no theory but that of a real resurrection is either tenable or rational, say what you will.

In conclusion, the story of a sculptor who essayed to fashion a figure of the Christ may be worth repeating, though I cannot vouch for its accuracy.

He studied his New Testament and labored diligently for a year. Then he called in his little daughter. She entered the studio, but took no notice of the statue beside which her father stood. He at once knew that he had failed.

A second year of more intensive study followed. He tried to put into the face the things which he now saw in the Gospel story. Then he called the child in again; for he felt that the impression made upon her would decide the question of success or failure.

She came in, but this time she noticed the statue. Gazing at it for a moment, she said: "He was a good man, wasn't he, Papa?" Again he knew that he had failed; but he only became the more determined to succeed.

He realized that he must obtain a vision of the Christ as he really was before he could reproduce his face in marble, and this time he fairly agonized over his work in the effort to see what the disciples had seen before they wrote the Gospels and preached a risen Christ to men.

Under those conditions the face gradually took on the look which he had tried so long to visualize and reproduce. Finally, with fear and trembling, he called in the child again. This time she stopped, looked at the statue,

rushed up to it, threw her arms about it, and burst into tears.

He had succeeded. He had come to understand, and he had himself been transformed in the process. That is the inevitable effect of a true vision of the Christ. Those who obtain it can never be the same again. Better and nobler they must be, and their doubts, if doubts they have, must flee away. Questioning the divinity of that wonderful personality will cease to be possible. And his message will become imperative. They must heed and obey.

With those of old they will say: "Never-yet spake thus a man." (Οὐδέποτε ἐλάλησεν οὕτως ἄνθρωπος.) No man ever did so speak. Do you imagine that a man ever could so speak? Is it possible? or credible? or natural, for a man to speak as Christ spoke when on earth? Would you listen to such talk to-day?

Think what he said. "I will give you rest." "I am the way, the truth, and the life." "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." Suppose a man made such statements as these to-day, how long would he remain outside the insane asylum? Can you think of Christ as insane? Can you think of him as self-deluded? Can you believe that he was a fraud?

Was he a John L. Sullivan sort of man, who commanded obedience and respect because of his physique, as some would have us believe, or was he rather a being out of whose eyes there shone such a divine light that men were awed into silence in his presence? When Isaiah said

(liii. 2), "he hath no form or comeliness," he denied that the Christ would be of commanding physique. Was he? or was his power the power of the spirit?

Have you had a vision of the Christ as the sculptor did? If not, on what grounds do you consider yourself competent to decide who and what he was? And on what do you reject him, if you have done a thing so foolish and unworthy?

Simon Peter answered and said, Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.

And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona: for flesh and blood hath not revealed *it* unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven."

(Mt. xvi. 16 f.)

INDEX

- Animal kingdom, 32f.
Article in Greek, 68, 106ff.
Assir, 94, 98, 101
Bandits, 184, 230
Bar-, 54ff., 89f., 107, 238
Bastard, a, 46, 48, 55, 65, 71, 112, 118f., 123, 232, 235ff., 251
Bastard, the, 17, 48, 67
Begotten son, 99f., 103, 110, 124, 240
Bibliotheca Saera, 78, 85, 90, 230
Blood tests, 127
Canaanites, 225
Celsus, 13, 105, 253
Cerinthus, 12, 49
Chronology, Bible, 87, 91
Commandments, 228f.
Complete domination, 169f.
Custom, Jewish, 57f., 86
Daniel, 151, 156f.
David, seed of, 80f., 87
Deep-sea life, 69, 136
Devil, the, 169, 187, 193, 199, 205
Discrepancies, 84ff.
Divinity of Jesus, 20f., 75, 176, 196f., 208, 260
Egyptian magic, 17, 55, 118, 174, 181, 197
Evolution, 11, 125ff., 142, 149, 241
Experience, 19, 34, 143f., 167, 172, 174
Forgiveness, 218
God's laws, 216
"Gosta Berling," 53
Greek quoted, 52, 79, 132, 183, 194, 200, 211f., 260
Hebrew names, 60, 93, 97f., 108f.
Holy Ghost, 17, 49, 64f., 72, 168, 177, 180, 249
Holy Spirit, 30f., 44f., 77, 121, 167f., 170f., 176, 179f., 237, 239, 250
Huxley, 121f., 126, 128, 228
Insult to Jesus, 54f.
Josephus, 104, 111, 131ff., 145, 251ff.
Judas, 52, 85
Justice, 228f.
Levirite marriage, 88, 95, 100
Lie, 16, 67, 70, 207, 236, 256
Life, 32ff., 42, 46, 239
Lord, 52, 80ff., 180, 189f., 247
Lucretius, 11, 126, 128, 139
Messiah, 22, 111f., 132, 145, 154f., 157, 159, 173, 182, 188, 198, 225, 233
Mind, human, 29f., 40
Miracles, 56, 62, 118, 124, 129f., 133f., 136ff., 146, 154, 175, 194, 197f., 200, 206ff., 242, 248, 255, 258f.
Mystery, 41, 115, 172, 248
Names omitted, 90f., 93, 100
Nathan, 88, 96, 101, 111
Natural law, 124, 136ff., 216, 248
New Thought, 13, 40, 115
Patronymics, 61, 89, 95, 107
Personalities, complex, 38ff., 163ff.
Peter, the name, 202
Pitcairn Island, 150
Plague, 61, 154
Pliny, younger, 146, 253
Private line, 92, 96, 110
"Quelle" theory, 19, 257f.
Resurrection, 80f., 133f., 146, 199, 209, 233, 254ff.
Samaritans, 90, 160, 238
Scapegoat Messiah, 132, 145, 155
Septuagint, 152, 190
Seventy weeks, 158f.
Sex problems, 46, 122f.
Sin, 65, 174, 179ff., 184, 188, 209, 214ff., 222f., 225ff., 230ff., 246
Slang, 15, 183, 198
Soul, 34ff., 41f., 239
Suffix -son, 58ff., 89
Syriac Version, 49ff., 76
Tacitus, 130f., 144f.
Tetragrammaton, 180f.
"Toldoth Jeshu," 55, 65ff., 182, 236
Tradition, 19, 87, 102, 141, 160f., 192
Trinity, 14, 20, 26ff., 44f., 249
Virgin birth, 15f., 20, 48, 50, 68f., 71, 74, 77ff., 82, 120, 123, 129, 148, 176f.
Word content, 30, 63, 198, 243

VOLTS FROM A LAYMAN'S DYNAMO



Other volumes of the series, ready for the printer or nearly so, are:—

I. NUTS FOR CRITICS TO CRACK

An exposure of the weak spots in the armor of the higher critics and an exploitation of the seven canons of validity.

III. GOSPELS: NOT PARASITIC LITERATURE

This volume pictures New Testament times in such a way as to make clear the absurdity of a "Source theory" for Matthew, Luke, and John.

IV. SCHOLARLY OPINION AND ITS LIMITATIONS

A series of concrete illustrations of the manner in which scholars omit vital elements in their conclusions and so exploit half truths.

V. THE ICE AGE AND THE FLOOD

A scientific defense of the Biblical flood based on the geological findings of geologists. They have determined the facts without correlating them.

VI. MINOR BIBLICAL PROBLEMS

This volume deals with such topics as Inspiration, The Problem of Evil, The Sanity of Abraham, The Red Sea, The "Mistakes of Moses," The Jordan and Jericho, Joshua's Command to the Sun and Moon, Jonah and the Whale, Christianity and Pacifism, etc.

VII. ODDS AND ENDS FROM THE WORK-SHOP

As indicated by the title, this volume gathers together some of the papers of the author that have been read with interest. They include:—The Neglected Factor, The Taproot of Higher Criticism and the New Theology, Mushroom or Toadstool, The Literary Form of the First Chapter of Genesis, Some Anomalies in Human Beliefs, The Split Infinitive, The Misplaced Adverb, etc.; but some changes may be made in the completed volume.

[Which one of these appeals to you the most? A postal sent to the author may help him to decide the question as to which one will be published next.]



HERBERT. W. MAGOUN

89 HILLCREST ROAD - - - - BELMONT, MASS.

*An Exposition of the Book of Revelation which gives
the Apostle John the credit of having
said what he meant to say.*

THE APOCALYPSE OF JESUS CHRIST OR REAPPEARANCE

By WILLIAM J. McKNIGHT, D.D.

JOHN TO THE SEVEN CHURCHES

The Book of Revelation has always been the GREAT ENIGMA in the field of Biblical Exposition.

The present volume makes the reader feel that the GREAT ENIGMA has at last been prevailed upon to yield its secret to the inquiring mind.

This first volume of Dr. McKnight's commentary on Revelation is a most promising book. It is not merely helpful and suggestive, it is indispensable. The best that the other commentators have said is quoted freely, the local setting is pictured vividly, and the historical background is cleverly woven about the whole. Best of all, the author has a true conception not only of the inwardness of Palestinian Greek but also of the true nature of primitive Christianity. It is a rare thing in these days to find such a satisfying book on any Biblical subject, to say nothing of Revelation. — H. W. MAGOUN, PH.D.

It will appeal to the PREACHER and the SCHOLAR, for each lecture has a Prefatory dealing with the Greek text critically and exegetically, while the book as a whole contains material for as many as fifteen or twenty fresh, fascinating, enlightening and stimulating sermons.

HANDSOMELY BOUND. Price \$3.00

HAMILTON BROTHERS

HAMILTON PLACE, BOSTON 9, MASS.

FOURTEEN DAYS

A fine of TWO CENTS will be charged for each day the Book is kept over time.

DE 6 '71

[illegible]

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY
232.8 M275
Magoun, H. W./Volts from a layman's dyna



3 4320 00073 3032

232.8 M275 v. 2
AC. #2603

Magoun, H. W.

Volts from a layman's dynamo

232.8 M275 v. 2

AC. #2603

Magoun, H. W.

Volts from a layman's dynamo

